S.L/23-5-a-15 178.2





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/b22651779

With the Author's
Compliments

NEPHALISM

THE

TRUE TEMPERANCE.

Thirty-third Thousand.

In Paper Covers, 6d; in Cloth Limp, 1s; in Handsome Cloth Binding, 1s 6d; in Fancy Cloth, Extra Gilt, 2s; Post Free,

ALCOHOL: ITS PLACE AND POWER. By JAMES MILLER, F.R.S.E., F.R.C.S.E., Surgeon in Ordinary to the Queen and His Royal Highness the Prince Consort for Scotland, Professor of Surgery in the University of Edinburgh, &c.

Opinions of the Press.

"This able and earnest little book * * * The present work is essentially a medical one, although written with great eloquence, in clear, popular language."—*Edinburgh Medical Journal.*

"A truly able and temperate work on a subject so prescriptively obnoxious to extreme views as 'Alcohol' is rarely met with."—*Sanitary Review.*

NEPHALISM

THE

TRUE TEMPERANCE

OF

SCRIPTURE, SCIENCE, AND EXPERIENCE.

BY

JAMES MILLER, F.R.S.E.

SURGEON IN ORDINARY FOR SCOTLAND TO THE QUEEN,
AND TO H.R.H. THE PRINCE CONSORT,
PROFESSOR OF SURGERY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH,
AUTHOR OF "ALCOHOL: ITS PLACE AND POWER."

ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας ὄντες, νήφωμεν.



GLASGOW:
SCOTTISH TEMPERANCE LEAGUE.
1861.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS
LIBRARY
CLASS 178.Y
ACCN. 2437
SOURCE
DATE

GLASGOW:
PRINTED BY S. AND T. DUNN,
26 *West Nile Street.*

PREFACE.

AT a Meeting of the Committee of the Edinburgh University Temperance Society, held in the Civil Law Class Retiring Room, on Monday, February 27, 1860—It was proposed by the Chairman, and seconded by Mr D. M'Donald, M.A., and unanimously agreed to—

"That Professor Miller be solicited to publish his Lectures on Nephalism, lately delivered in this University, and to dedicate them to the Members of this Society.

(Signed) W. BURNS THOMSON, Chairman.
J. PARKER CROSBY, Secretary."

This letter, with the terms of which I have most cheerfully complied, serves at once for both Preface and Dedication.

In the first part of these Lectures, the reader may recognize some things which he has seen before, in a former publication, "Alcohol: Its Place and Power"

—put, however, in a different way, and made more plain and practical.

Of the clerical profession, and others learned in theology, I fear that I have need to crave indulgence; and would venture to express a hope that, if, in stepping for a little out of my own walk into their domain, I have seemed to take too much upon me, and given evidence, perhaps, of the frailties that beset a novice, some excuse may be found in the motive which has prompted the trespass.

May those who are more competent to the task be stirred up to investigate the truth, more ably and fully, in regard to this great question, which so nearly concerns us all!

JAS. MILLER.

NOTE.

THE following work was, in substance, originally delivered in the form of Lectures to the students of the University of Edinburgh. Strongly desirous of securing for the Temperance Cause another contribution from the pen of the Author of "Alcohol: Its Place and Power," the Directors of the Scottish Temperance League requested permission to publish the series after they had been delivered, and were prepared to enter on terms for the copyright in a manner befitting, in some measure, the value of any production from such a pen. Professor Miller kindly and cordially complied with their request; and not content with his former act of distinguished liberality in presenting the League with the copyright of his valuable treatise on Alcohol, he has, in

the same generous spirit, placed the no less valuable work now given to the public, at the free disposal of the Board, with no other stipulation than that the publication should be so conducted as to embrace the largest possible sphere of usefulness.

Scottish Temperance League Office,
108 Hope Street, Glasgow,
December, 1, 1860.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

Introductory.

Alcohol not Food—an Error *loci*—a Luxury—a Medicine—Modern Timothies—Sir Henry Havelock—The True Commissariat—A Bible Precedent—Prevention not Cure, ... Pp. 9-18

Nephalism Advocated on Personal Grounds.

1. *Physical.*—Effects on Health—The *Vix Medicatrix*—Skilful Practitioners—Tippoo Sahib's Regimen—Strength and Condition—Training—Hard Work—Jellalabad—Danger of Masking Fatigue—General Jacob—A Victim, ... Pp. 19-30

2. *Mental Condition.*—Effects on the Brain—Imagination—Reason—The Emotions—The Will—Deceitful Appearances—Ancient and Modern Morality, ... Pp. 31-38

3. *The Moral Condition.*—Effect on Conscience—Coleridge—The Cry of another Victim—Errors in Medicine—The Spiritual Condition—Tendencies always the same—Cases in Illustration—Spurious Religion—A Dying Bed—Hinders the Pilgrimage—The Law and the Testimony—Kings and Priests—A Royal Priesthood—Be Sober—Watch—Fight—Strive—Training—The Great Commandment—The Keeping of the Great Commandment—The Drink—When Drunk—Drunk, when not Sober—Examples—The Clergyman—Advantages of Nephalism—the Plank—the Bridge—Second Great Commandment, ... Pp. 39-72

Nephalism Advocated on Public Grounds.

Auxiliary Means—Drinking Customs—Drink, Drank, Drunk—Dangers of Moderate Drinking—Break Down the Drinking Customs—Influence of Example—A Cowgate Charity Ball—Drunkards must Abstain—Drunkards can't Abstain Alone—Companionship Wanted—Christian Duty and Privilege—The Good Samaritan—An Army Precedent—Christian Self-denial—The Penitent's Appeal—The Fear of Man—The Golden Rule—The Elder Startled—The Elder Triumphant—"Go and do thou likewise," . . Pp. 73-95

Nephalism Advocated on Peculiar and Professional Grounds.

1. *Ministers of the Gospel.*—Paul's Episcopos—Come! *v.* Go!—The Minister's Example—The Shepherd and the Sheep—The Good Shepherd—The Monday's Dinner—The Americans—The Revivals—The Missionaries—Home Missions—Spiritual Husbandry—Clerical Intemperance—Paul's Training—A Nephalist Church—Brotherly Love—Brotherly Love and Charity, . . . Pp. 96-113

2. *Medical Men.*—Medical Men—Nephalist Medical Men, Pp. 113-115

3. *Educationists.*—Educationist, ... P. 115

4. *Students.*—Students—the Tinder-Box—Elia and Coleridge—Other Professions—Resumé—Conclusion of the Whole Matter, Pp. 116-122

PART II.

Objections Met.

The Most Common.—The Plea of Moderation—Against Excess—Moderation does not Prevent Excess—On the Contrary—A Dangerous Manifesto—the Creatures of God—Enter not into Temptation—Use and Abuse—the Chinaman—Let your Moderation be Known—Liberty—the Bible's Liberty—Christian Liberty—Liberty from

Contents.

Self—"As I have Loved you"—Paul's Liberty—the Grades of Morality—Grades of Temperance Virtue—Highest Grade—Example of Christ—Different Kinds of Wine—Old and New—Unfermented Wine—Captain Treatt—Dr Duff—the Meanings of "Wine"—the Wine of Judea—Doctored Wines—Mixed Wine—Strong Drink—Option in Drinking—Christ's Example—the Nazarite's Example—the Marriage of Cana—the True Solution—the True Following—A Help to Religion—Convalescents—the Rivet—Testimonies of Help to Religion—Not "Another Gospel"—Moral and Spiritual Husbandry—Need of Good Men to Guide—Personal Influence—Personal Responsibility—Scriptural Examples—Apostolic Times—Lord's Supper—Scriptural Command—General Principles—Bible Commends Wine—Therapeutic Principles—Broken Pledges—Seventy times Seven—Haste to the Rescue—Seedtime and Harvest—A Fair Field and No Favour—Danger of Reaction—Deal with the Young—Difficulty not always Real, ... Pp. 123-203

Some of the Real Objections.—They Like the Drink—Want of Due Benevolence—Prejudice Against the System—Moral Deficiency—True Courage—True Love—the True Man, . . . Pp. 204-210

Appendix, ... P. 211

PART I.

—o—

In proposing to advocate Nephalism on grounds Scriptural, Philosophical, and Experimental, it is necessary to define the term.

Νηφω, I do not drink wine or strong drink; νηφαλιος, without wine or strong drink; νηφαλισμος, the condition of being without wine or strong drink, or true sobriety. Such is the derivation of the word; and by it is meant the habitual practice of abstaining from all ordinary or luxurious use of intoxicants, reserving them exclusively for those occasions when medicinal or other urgent necessity requires their careful and regulated employment.

Our position involves three points. 1. Alcohol, the intoxicating element of all strong drinks, *is not food*, properly so called; and therefore is not to be used as such. 2. *It is a luxury;* and, to many, a great one; but so dangerous in its effects, physically, mentally, and morally, as to be forbidden, as a mere luxury, to the prudent and upright. 3. *It is a medicine;* capable of being employed, not unfrequently, with due care

and skill, so as to prove highly beneficial. And, consequently, while we decline to use it as food, necessary to life, or as a luxurious superfluity of life, we do not refuse its medicinal aid when called for by the necessity of disease.

1. *It is not food.* Having already discussed that question elsewhere,* I need not dwell on it here. Suffice it to say, that the authorities best entitled to credit, place alcohol, not in the *materia alimentaria*, but in the *materia medica;* ranking it not as a nutritious, but as a narcotic article, and consequently a poison.

People say, "Long custom has made it food; I have for many years used it moderately as such; and I often feel much the better for it; it certainly helps digestion, and seems to increase my sensations of health and comfort." The answer is, No length or generality of custom can change wrong into right; harm to the system may be done, while he who sustains it is not at all sensible of the fact; and sensation of benefit does not imply reality. Tell me, you man in health, that a glass of wine, or a "dram" of spirits, is needful to the just digestion of your beef or fish, and I answer that the use of stimulants to insure such digestion savours of excess, in tending to cause the eating of more than the stomach

* "Alcohol: Its Place and Power," p. 44.

naturally requires, and more than it can by its natural powers duly accommodate and dispose of. The right arrangement is, not to eat, and stop and drink strong drink, and then to eat and drink again; but to eat only as the unstimulated appetite requires, refusing to combine unnecessary drinking with unnecessary eating, or gluttony, or to make the one subservient to the other.

One of the cardinal and most important blunders of our domestic and social state, is this *error loci* in regard to strong drinks. They have most unfortunately got a place in general estimation as food, and evils incalculable have resulted. The drug is a good drug; but, taken as food, most perilous. "A bull in a china shop" is a common proverb, illustrative of similar evil. The bull, of himself, is well enough, and may indeed be a highly respectable animal in his own place and way; but in a china shop his presence is wholly unsuitable, and likely to prove most disastrous. And even so it is here. The alcohol is a "good creature" as a medicine, and as such can be made to do good service to humanity; but, as food, let it get into our pantries, among our breads and beefs, and then the crashing of China, under the taurine influence, will be but a faint symbol of the evils manifold, physical, social, and moral, which may and do accrue from such unfortunate misplacement.

Recognizing Alcoholics to be no true food, we refrain from using them as such; and wisely discard them from our ordinary diet table.

2. *Alcohol is a luxury.* So is opium. The Chinaman, addicted to *his* peculiar luxury, would rather want food, house, and clothing, than go without his fumes. Opium is the greatest possible luxury to him. Nevertheless, it is still a narcotic and a poison. And no man, not even its most debased and helpless victim, will venture to say that its use as a luxury is other than pernicious;* although, in certain cases of

* The opinion of Sir John Bowring, or of any one else interested, directly or indirectly, in the opium traffic, is of no value in this matter. Here is the verdict of an impartial and recent observer, Mr Arthur Fraser, as to the state of things in Java, "Let a native only once taste the alluring pipe, it is rare that he can stop—he goes on from bad to worse, neglects his family, perhaps seduces them to the same fatal vice, gradually incapacitates himself for work, sells every article he possesses, and ends generally in robbery, or perhaps murder, in order to get the means of indulging his insatiable craving." And again, "No sooner does it transpire that any trader has taken to smoking opium, than his credit in the mercantile world is gone—he is immediately looked upon as a lost man." Hear also a sad voice at home:—"Behold," says the biographer of Coleridge, "the inevitable consequences which follow that 'accursed practice'—Property consumed! health destroyed! independence bartered! respectability undermined! family concord subverted! that peace sacrificed, which forms so primary an ingredient in man's cup of happiness! a deadly war with conscience! an example to others, which extends its baneful influences illimitably!"

disease, and in the hands of the skilful practitioner, no article of the materia medica is more capable of being turned into a real blessing.

Wine, Whisky, Brandy, are to many great luxuries. They are pleasant to the taste of the initiated; the immediate effects are exhilarating; and to not a few, indeed, comfort and happiness may be almost utter strangers except when evoked by the use of these things. Still, they are of the materia medica, and depend for all their pleasant effects on the ingredient which ranks there, like opium, as a narcotic and a poison. In certain forms of disease, use them rightly, and they are not only blameless, but praiseworthy. Use them as mere luxuries, at the bidding of appetite or custom, and their risk is great; tending to enslave the user, so that, ere long, he cannot, if he would, shake off their chains; and tending ultimately to produce that obvious excess, intemperance, which is the parent of so much crime, and misery, and woe.

3. *Alcohol is a medicine*—a "narcotic," or "narcotic stimulant," and not the least valuable of the class; but, like all the others, in order to the production of real good and no evil, requiring both care and skill in the handling. Some, like Dr Higginbotham, deny it a place in this category at all—eschewing it utterly, in every form, and in every circumstance. We think this a great mistake; and our position is, that while we

refuse to use alcohol, either as food, which it is not, or as a luxury, which it is—but most unsafe—we do not refuse to use it as a medicine, when satisfied, on good grounds, that its medicinal use is really required. For myself, I will not consent to forego the professional use of this important agent; because I am convinced that without it I could not treat, so satisfactorily and successfully as I now do, many an important form of disease. But, at the same time, I will take special care in all cases, so far as in me lies, to make sure that a necessity for its use really does exist; and I will see well to the regulation of the dose, as regards both amount and duration.

If asked to give an idea of its use in medicine, I would say in brief, that it is of service in certain chronic ailments, such as some forms of dyspepsia; given sparingly, and in its weaker and more elegant forms. "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities," is a precept applicable to Timothies in the present day.*

* But let them see that they make Timothy's use of it (Alcohol: its Place and Power, p. 75). Ordinarily water drinkers; taking a *little* wine for the *stomach's* sake (not for the *palate's*), and for many and sore sicknesses or weaknesses (πυκνὰς ἀσθενείας); not for every trifling ache or ail. It is a question, no doubt, what *kind* of wine is here meant. It may be the bland and unintoxicating; but I am quite ready to admit

In certain acute diseases, as some conditions of fever alcohol is invaluable, even in its strongest forms; and may be used freely. And in the crisis of exhaustion, whether by loss of blood, or profuseness of purulent discharge, it is sometimes the most manageable and successful of stimulants.

In exhaustion, independent of actual disease, too, I am ready to admit that the use of alcoholic stimuli may occasionally be both warrantable and expedient: as when important work must be done within a limited time, and when neither rest nor food (true refreshment) are available. Thus it was, for instance, that Havelock, that noble Nephalist, just before fighting the decisive battle of Cawnpore, in his brilliant advance to the relief of Lucknow, served out an allowance of porter and biscuit to his brave little army; there being no time for cooking, and the men having had no repast for forty-eight hours. They must fight on the instant; and nothing but this, on which to fight, was to be had on the instant. The spur alone was available then; it was applied accordingly; and the work that could brook no delay was done: one little incident proving, however, how careful even the most competent should be in such administration—

that it may be, also, the fermented, containing the narcotic ingredient. The apostle, though ordering it in a dietetic connection, still orders it medicinally.

the Madras Fusileers, we are told, comparatively unaccustomed to the stimulus, *staggered a little* as they first marched off into the fight.*

This I take to be in harmony with the true system of commissariat; not to serve out wine and spirits to the men, day by day, under all circumstances alike, but to reserve them solely for medicinal purposes, and such emergencies as may arise in the campaign. And, in reference to this, one is reminded of a Scriptural precedent. When David had to take the field hastily, under the pressure of his revolted son Absalom, "Ziba, the servant of Mephibosheth, met him, with a couple of asses saddled, and upon them two hundred loaves of bread, and an hundred bunches of raisins,

* Indeed, there was a mistake as to the amount of dose over the whole troops, as well as in regard to the time of it (a most important point in the administration of drugs). The porter was served out at 1 p.m.; they then marched about four miles, and won a hard contested field ere nightfall. The sun never seemed so hot as that day; men and officers alike confessed that they never before had felt so thoroughly exhausted by fatigue; and there were an unusual number of casualties by sun-stroke. Altogether, the result of the alcoholic prescription appeared so unsatisfactory to the General, that he immediately issued a general order, that, in future, no strong drink should be served out during the middle part of the day, under any consideration whatever. This I have on the unquestionable authority of a medical officer, who was present, and on whose breast the Victoria cross now hangs, for daring deeds done in a subsequent part of that brilliant campaign.

and an hundred of summer fruits, and *a* bottle of wine. And the king said unto Ziba, What meanest thou by these? And Ziba said, The asses be for the king's household to ride on; and the bread and summer fruits for the young men to eat; *and the wine, that such as be faint in the wilderness may drink.*" (2 Sam. xvi. 1, 2.) The articles of food were for ordinary and general consumpt; but the one bottle of wine —no doubt, a largish one, as the leathern bottles were of those days—was not for the young men as food, nor for the king's private table as a luxury, but only for those that "be faint" by the way.

The simple and sensible position of the Nephalist, therefore, is to refuse alcoholics as food and luxuries, and to use them only when the crisis of disease, or other necessity, demands them. Their proper place and power is medicinal; and, when so used, the law of Tolerance* comes in to protect the user. Used

* For the statement and illustration of this law, see "Alcohol: its Place and Power," p. 32. Some will have it that this law is fanciful and new-fangled; but it is not so. Even in our common sayings it may be found, giving another illustration, among many, of how often these are based on accurate observation. You hear boys and girls rhyming in the streets the old refrain—

"Tobacco reek! tobacco reek!
It makes me well when I am sick.
Tobacco reek! tobacco reek!
When I am well it makes me sick."

unnecessarily, even though not recklessly, they do harm and no good; used necessarily and warily, they do good and no harm.

But may they not prevent disease? No. Dr Livingstone writes home from Central Africa—"We are at length satisfied that quinine does not *prevent* the fever, but is a specific when it comes." The medicine is not advisable till the morbid state, for which, as a "creature of God," it is intended, has arrived. Before then, taken in any appreciable quantity, its effect is hurtful more or less.

So much for preliminaries. Let us now proceed to consider the reasons for Nephalism, somewhat in detail; and first, of THE PERSONAL.

And what is thus popularly true of this narcotic, is both popularly and philosophically true of all its class—alcoholics not excepted.

Nephalism advocated on Personal Grounds.

—o—

THE personal grounds may be taken, as affecting the Physical, Mental, Moral, and Spiritual nature of man.

I. THE PHYSICAL.

Nephalism tends to health. Facts going to prove this might easily be accumulated. But we may be content with again referring to the case of the insurance office,* which, dividing its insurers into two classes, the Temperates and the Nephalists, finds, after some years, that the latter have the advantage on the score of longevity, by about 20 per cent. Or take the ascertained difference between the sick clubs of Preston—ordinary and abstinent. In the former, out of 1000 members in the habit of "using" (not abusing, we suppose) strong drink, 23 members were laid aside by sickness, *per annum*, for an average period of

* "Alcohol: its Place and Power," p. 127.

7 weeks and 4 days, and at a cost of 56 shillings per member; whereas in the abstinent, the numbers were —out of 1000 members, 13 sick for 3 weeks and 2 days, at a cost of 29 shillings.

How such things should be we can easily understand.* "I regard even the temperate use of wine," says Dr Andrew Combe—a high authority in such matters—"*when not required by the state of the constitution, as always more or less injurious.*"

1. The unnecessary use of these medicinals, we know, according to the converse of the Law of Tolerance, tends to produce certain diseases—such as gout, affections of the liver, skin, heart, arteries, kidneys, &c.† And such diseases, therefore, when not so provoked, will be all the less likely to occur.

2. According to observation, the Nephalist also possesses a comparative immunity from contagious diseases and epidemics. Or, in other words, he is not only less prone than other men to form diseases for himself, but also more capable of resisting those

* The occasional cases of hard drinkers proving long livers, of which drinking men are apt to make so much delusive capital in their arguments, are only exceptions to the general rule—confirming. It has been very truly said, "Every healthy toper is a decoy duck, and no more proves that health is safe in intemperance, than does an unwounded soldier that life is secure in battle."

† "Alcohol: its Place and Power," p. 20, et seq, and p. 121.

which are, as it were, already made, and thrust themselves upon the community at large. *

3. When disease has come, the Nephalist is specially capable of being influenced satisfactorily by remedial means. An organism which is virgin to medicinals, will be far more susceptible of their influence than that which is already saturated by them. Take fever for an illustration. Two men are under it, and require stimulus. A table-spoonful of sherry every two or three hours is thought needful, and is given to each. In him to whom this is a new thing, the effect is decided; but to him who aforetime has had his bottle day by day, continually, it is no more than so much cold water. "Double the dose," you say. Well, even then, the same beneficial effect is not produced as in the other; while the serious risk of *overdosing* is incurred. A spur, pricking the flank of a fresh horse, does wonders in the way of a *demivolte;* but the rowels may be run home in the raw sides of the daily bestridden hack, with but little acceleration of its sorry speed; and a further increase of impetus in the rider's heel may end only in rack or founder.

4. In the Nephalist, moreover, the working of the *Vis Medicatrix Naturae* is specially free. Its wheels are all unclogged, and go smoothly—a circumstance

* Op. Cit., p. 117.

of highest value to both patient and practitioner, inasmuch as without the co-operation of such unseen aid, be it humbly and honestly confessed, recoveries from both injury and disease would be far less frequent than they are. Sir Charles Napier, the hero of Scinde, tells us, in his own quaint way, when describing the effects of a *coup de soleil*, "I was tumbled over by the heat with apoplexy. Forty-three others were struck, all Europeans; and all died within three hours except myself! I do not drink! That is the secret. The sun had no ally in the liquor amongst my brains." And I well remember the honest and humorous confession of a late eminent physician of this city, to the effect that he had obtained a wonderful celebrity with a certain class of *bons vivants* in a very simple way, viz.:—by ordering some plain *placebo*, or little better, with strenuous injunction, on its account, to avoid all alcoholics, in every form and shape. "They come back well," said he, "and think it's the physic has done it; but it's the cold water, sir, the cold water—a grand alterative after their daily clarets, and brandies, and champagnes." His sagacity saw that all they needed was to remove the misplaced physic of the dining table, and give the *Vis Medicatrix* a fair field for working out the remedying of that disorder which the medicated diet had produced.

I might also instance the success of a practitioner

on a yet larger scale, Tippoo Sahib, whose treatment Dr Gregory was wont to quote in his lecturing, to the following effect—"He stated that, on the occasion of a large contingent of our troops having been withdrawn from the Bengal Presidency, to assist in the war of the Mysore, last century, many of the officers had left Calcutta with incipient liver disease, and with complexions so sallow that their friends had little hopes of ever again seeing them. Many of them fell prisoners into the hands of Tippoo, and had the good fortune to be cured by that great physician, by methods similar to those now proposed for the dipsomaniacs. The warnings of our profession are often despised, like those of the Trojan prophetess,—*Nunquam credenda Trojanis*—and so it had fared with the warning of the Bengal doctors. But the severe oriental regime of the new doctor at Seringapatam was, fortunately for his patients, enforced by the bolts and bars of his dungeons; and was therefore very effectual in restoring their health and their complexions. On their return to Calcutta, they found many of their old friends, who had predicted their decease, labouring under the very symptoms from which they had recovered, and learned that others, whom they had left in good health, had been swept away by the same malady in the intervening period.

"This, I think, is the sum and substance of Dr Gre-

gory's very graphic illustration of an important and practical principle. These facts were, in all probability, derived from some of the officers; many of whom he doubtless had seen—for the incidents happened in his own day. They occurred before I was born, yet I recollect well to have met, and conversed, in early life, with an old colonel who had been a prisoner of Tippoo, and whose accounts of his treatment at Seringapatam were deeply interesting, and altogether confirmatory of the severity of the regimen of that learned pundit. What might we not do, if we could, like him, enforce our wise prescriptions?"*

Nephalism gives strength and "condition;" and both of these are essential to the endurance of bodily labour. It is not enough to be strong; one blow, or one effort, does not complete the task; there must be a succession of these; and for the maintaining of this succession, at once in safety and in power, what is called "condition," or the perfection of bodily health, is absolutely required. Many a studious man, chained to his chair, day by day, is strong—strong as a giant, perhaps. Take him to a dynamometer, and he may drive the piston home wondrously; but put him suddenly to hard physical labour, sustained—to work a fire engine, to heave coals, to run a mile, to box or

* For this statement I am indebted to Dr John Gairdner of this city.

wrestle—his strength will be found to stand him in poor stead. Through lack of "condition," he will either fail in his task, or accomplish it painfully, and imperfectly; and at the cost, not only of much exhaustion of his working power, but also of much risk to his working machinery. By due training, however, put the same man into high health, or "condition," and you will find him possessed not only of strength considerably increased, but also of a power of using it for a lengthened period, without fatigue, and without danger.

And how is this to be obtained? In what does this training consist? Mainly in diet and exercise. To be strong, then, one must use strong drink freely? Nay. There is much difference between strong drink and strengthening drink. Whisky is a good sample of the one; water of the other. The athletes of old, in the Isthmian games, how came they to their wondrous bodily perfection? Strong meats and strong drinks? Of the one but sparingly; of the other none.

> Qui studet optatam cursu contingere metam,
> Multa tulit, fecitque puer: sudavit, et alsit;
> Abstinuit venere, et vino.

And it is much the same now. There is no great good to be extracted from the prize ring; but there is always this, viz., that perfection of strength and

"condition" of body, along with almost absolute command of temper, are to be obtained by a system of diet, which either altogether excludes alcoholics, or admits them only of weak form and sparing quantity—the former alternative the better of the two.

Besides, independently of actual *training*, the advantage of water over other drinks in imparting strength and condition, or maintaining them during hard labour, is very apparent; and as to this, examples crowd upon our hands. We might take Mr Buckingham's batch of coal-heavers, who incredulously consented to try the internal "water-power" for a month, and came back at the end of that time, reporting favourably of the system, in the teeth of all their former habits and prejudices, and declaring their resolve to maintain it in the future. Or we might take the sorely-tried crew of the water-logged ship, alluded to by Dr Carpenter, who became exhausted at the pumps under the rations of spirits, but rallied under coffee and soup, and brought their ship into her haven—themselves thriven positively, under the almost unbroken labour of ninety days and nights. Or take the heroes of Jellalabad, shut up in siege for five months, without any strong drink whatever. "If there had been a spirit ration," says Havelock, "one-third of the labour would have been diminished, in consequence of soldiers becoming the inmates of the

hospital and guard-houses, or coming to their work with fevered brain and trembling hand, or sulky and disaffected, after the protracted debauch. Now, all is health, cheerfulness, industry, and resolution. . . . A long course of sobriety and labour has made men of mere boys of recruits, and brought the almost raw levy to the firm standard of the Roman discipline." General Pollock, commanding the relieving force, "had brought with him a large supply of provisions for the famishing garrison; but found that, with the exception of wine and spirits, they had supplied their own wants by their own exertions. Their bronzed countenances bore the stamp of robust health. *Constant exertion, combined with the absence of liquor,* and not less the consciousness of noble achievements, gave them an air of confidence and life very different from the depression which was expected to be seen in a body which had so long struggled for existence." Or we might rest content with one of the most recent illustrative instances, as stated by Mrs Wightman in her admirable little book, "Haste to the Rescue." "These men continued their work (in the hayfield) *without* stimulants, when the other haymakers who took drink to strengthen them, were, in the early afternoon, *hors de combat,*—prostrate on the field."

Power of work in the Nephalist is all real: in the man that uses stimulants, a portion, at least, is ficti-

tious—the result of the spur. And when he works continuously on that, the exhaustion may be great, and all but irreparable, ere ever he be aware; his fatigue is *masked.* The Nephalist, stopping from exhaustion, rests, soon recovers, and is on again; the other man, having exhausted his natural strength, continues his work upon that which is artificial, exhausting the other more and more—much more, probably, than the Nephalist could do, and perhaps to an extent that is altogether inconsistent with safety to the organism. At last, all strength, both natural and artificial, having come to an end, the prostration is utter, and may be with difficulty recovered from; all the more, if such sequence be not occasional only—as in the case of Havelock and his men at Cawnpore—but of constant repetition, day by day. The one man stops in time, and begins in time again, with pristine vigour; the other stops too late, and is both slow and weak in his resuming—if, indeed, he be able to start again at all.* The one is like a man walking with his feet on the ground; he falls, but is not hurt; rises and walks on. The other is as a man on high stilts; more likely to fall, and by the fall more likely to sustain fracture or sore bruise—an injury that may be fatal. So it fared with poor General

* Vide "Alcohol: its Place and Power," p. 83, et seq.

Jacob, one of the most gallant soldiers that ever graced the soil of India. Head of the Scinde horse, and in command of a large district, during the late terrible mutiny, duty called him to an amount of labour truly Herculean. He felt that he could devolve no part of his duty on another, and consequently lived in the saddle, with little food and with less repose. His strength, of course, gave way, and he took to stimulants; latterly existing almost entirely on them. No vice in this, no pandering to appetite; no subjection to prejudice or custom; but a gallant, though mistaken devotion and self-sacrifice to what he considered the paramount obligations of duty. At length Nature, even thus propped and stimulated, gives way; he falls exhausted. And what will raise him now? Stimulants? Their power is gone; that venture has been already made; and his weeping friends, helpless and hopeless, have but to see him die! Had he refrained from the deceitful aid of brandy, and trusted to such broken snatches of sleep, and portions of food, as circumstances would allow, he might not only have struggled through the campaign, like Sir Hugh Rose, but have been spared this day to his country—*decus et tutamen.*

But the bodily is not the only or main risk of such stilt-walking. The mental and moral transcends it quite. The narcotic, in its characteristic seductive-

ness, winds itself so round the man as to take him captive; he becomes its slave; and, in that captivity, the mental and moral nature suffers sad loss and degradation. Let one example here suffice. A clergyman from the South consulted me. His ailments were obviously due to habitual intemperance; and, taxed with it, he made confession with bitter tears. His sad history was briefly this. He had a large congregation, requiring heavy ministerial labour from week to week. His church had fallen into disrepair, and had to be renewed. Large debt, in consequence, was incurred; and, by an arrangement which, at all times, can never be too strongly reprobated—unbecoming, ungenerous, and unjust—the labour of raising the greater part of the money required was thrown upon him. He had to itinerate with his subscription-book, address meetings everywhere, and, at the same time, continue in great measure his customary labours in the pulpit at home. At first, he bore the drudgery without much sense of fatigue; by and by, however, he found that he must either stop, (would that he had!) or resort to a stimulant. He took bitter beer, and went on. Some time after, notwithstanding the accession of artificial strength, failure came again. Now he took wine. Once more, this too failed him; and then brandy was his restorative: not with meals only, but, from time to time, throughout the day,

according as the exigencies of his case seemed to require. So he continued to labour sadly on, with a single eye to overtaking all his work, and nerving himself for its due accomplishment. But at what risk and cost! He had moved as in a dream; at first pleasant enough, but gradually becoming more and more oppressive; and, at length, he painfully awoke to find the terrible reality of his fate—*he was a drunkard!* The power which he had hoped to make his helpful servant, had made him its helpless slave.

And this brings us to speak of

II. The Mental Condition.

Alcohol, swallowed, speedily passes from the alimentary system, we know, and makes straight for the nervous centres. Within the space of a very few minutes, it can be chemically detected there, by experimenting on the lower animals;* "ounces of fluid have been found within the ventricles of the brain, having all the physical qualities of alcohol."† And in dissecting the bodies of men who have died during, or immediately after, vinous debauch, a piece of cotton dipped in the cerebral fluid has been found to burn for a moment with a lambent flame, on a light being applied.

* "Alcohol: its Place and Power," p. 13.

† Brit. and For. Rev., Oct. 1859, p. 360.

One of the results of such saturation of the nervous matter is to cause an unusual determination of blood to it. Hence the sleep to the "comfortable old gentleman" evoked by the evening tumbler, "or night-cap;" hence, too, one cause of the change in the mental functions which alcoholics, taken in any considerable quantity, and without the protection of medicinal requirement, never fail to produce, more or less.

A curious example of how mere human instinct discovers, or at least acts on, this physiological fact of blood-determination, is afforded by the conduct of certain savage tribes, who, when enslaved by the "fire-water," and unable to gratify their morbid craving through lack of supply, are in the habit of compensating for the want by deliberately inverting themselves, and standing for a time on the crowns of their heads. What they may not do chemically, they effect by a very simple process of engineering!

Is determination of blood to the brain desirable, as regards either the health of the organ, or its play of function in connexion with the mind?

What is the effect on mental function? One element of mind—*Imagination*—is stimulated, quickened, made more free and brilliant for a time; bright thoughts and ideas come unasked, and fitting words may clothe them readily: "He is good company, to-night," say his boon companions; "one glass more,

and he will be at his best." But that point once reached, what difficulty there is in holding it! A little more of the stimulant, or a little more time to let what is already taken do its congestive work more thoroughly, and then the "crescendo" movement is followed by the "diminuendo." The sparkle goes off, sometimes rapidly, and ere long all is dull and dead. The man who has to trust to such adventitious means for helping his imagination, is like a revolving light on some tall Pharos; the flash, meteor-like, is followed by the wane; and this, in its turn, is soon quenched in utter blackness, not to be revived by the continued working of the mechanism, nor by any voluntary effort, nor by some accidental force of circumstance, but only to be lit up after a long time by the same fiery torch as before—"When he awakes, he will seek it yet again."

Perception and *memory* are quickened too; but their accuracy is endangered.

Reason (conception, comparison, and *understanding*—in short, accurate perception and exact appreciation of *Relations* of every sort,) sustains no increase or elevation, but the contrary; its point and edge are blunted from the first; its working, if not perverted, is at least obscured, more or less, according to the amount of the stimulus, and the susceptibility of the brain. One of the simplest of all experiments will illustrate this. Let a healthy man

dine out, and take his "few glasses of wine," that he may "enjoy himself with his friends;" then, while his cheek is yet flushed, his temples pulsating firmly, with a general glow upon him, and his brain in full activity, whether with his will or no—he could write you a sonnet—or sing it—full well perhaps, or pen you a chapter or two of a romance—but let him sit down to a difficult calculation in figures, to an abstruse question in metaphysics, or to a recondite problem in mathematics, and he will probably find that an abundant will to the task is associated unfortunately with an impaired power of performance;* after a futile attempt, he will almost instinctively postpone the effort to a more convenient season; and next morning, when all is cool and clear, the effects of the brain-stimulus having passed away, the difficulty and the doubt will both be gone. After any large dose of

* "Don't take that man's horse, sir," said an Irish carman, one day, to Dr Cooke; "sure, he'll never take you over the road. Take mine, sir." "And is your's trust-worthy?" "An iligant horse; a perfect *poet* of a horse, sir." Struck with the element of poetry in connection with the hack in question, Dr Cooke consented; soon, to his regret, however—horse and car come to a hopeless stand-still on the first acclivity. "You rogue, is that the worth of your promise? did'nt you say that your horse was a poet?" "Sure, yer honour, and so he is," adding, as he whacked its sides; "so he is, in troth—a poet and nothing but a poet, *better in the imagination than the performance.*"

alcoholics, bordering on what is commonly called "excess," the intellectual obfuscation will, of course, be still more manifest. The man set upon mental work in down-right earnest, must "gird up the loins of his mind, and be sober," in the literal sense of that pregnant injunction (ἀναζωσαμενοι τας ὀσφυας της διανοιας ὑμων, νηφοντες). The wisest of all wise men, be it remembered, sought in his heart to give himself unto wine, *yet acquainting his heart with wisdom,* but found the two things incompatible—vanity and vexation of spirit.*

The *emotions (affections and desires)* are excited; but how? Not in the higher forms and purer tendencies. They are animalized. The excitement takes the sensual bias; and the result is "of the earth, earthy."

And, most markedly of all, *the power of control*—the

* By *imagination* is meant here the faculty of analogies or resemblances, either springing immediately from feeling and passion, or directly connected with the latter: by *understanding*, the faculty of relations generally, and of such relations especially as admit of exact measurement, in respect of time, place, or degree. The former appears to be the capacity, subservient to intellectual operation, which is alone quickened and heightened by stimulants. The latter—that is the power of appreciating with exactness measurable relations, is perhaps always and infallibly damaged by them. I make this statement advisedly; supported therein by the authority of one of the most eminent and trustworthy mental philosophers of the present day.

will—sustains diminution;* a state of things surely the very reverse of what is safe and suitable to reasonable and responsible man—made but "a little lower than the angels;" leaving him much at the mercy of an excited imagination, and of affections and desires which, while increased in power, are lowered in their tone and tendency.

Thus it is with all narcotics—but specially the alcoholic—taken unnecessarily, without the protection of the law of tolerance. If the brain have not blood enough, the blood-sending stimulus will prove satisfactory; and a man under fever, for example, with his liberal allowance of brandy, or claret, or port, may find his imagination regulated, his reason cleared, his affections untarnished, his self-control increased, by what, in circumstances of health, would have produced an effect directly contrary.

It may be said that men of intemperate lives, whether by use of opium or of alcoholics, have not only proved successful poets, but good reasoners. True; just as some men live long, intemperate, who would have lived much longer if temperate. So these

* "My case is a species of madness," says poor Coleridge of his insane passion for opium—"only that it is a derangement, *an utter impotence of the volition*, and not of the intellectual faculties. You bid me rouse myself: go bid a man paralytic in both arms, to rub them briskly together, and that will cure him. 'Alas!' he would reply, 'that I cannot move my arms is my complaint and misery.'"

writers would have reasoned much more clearly and powerfully, had they been without the "brain poison;" and the only reason why they were able to reason at all—why the narcotic, so constantly acting in excess, did not eat the reasoning power out of them—is this, that their intemperance occasioned such a morbid condition of the frame in general, and of the brain and nervous system in particular, as to admit of the law of tolerance protecting the latter in some degree from what would otherwise have proved directly and continuously injurious. Alcohol produces disease, which if not requiring, at least admits of alcohol as its partial and palliative remedy. The brain is damaged, suffering loss of power; what is left is propped up and made available for a time, by the very agent of its hurt; but the final result is calamitous, through progressive acceleration of decay notwithstanding.*

* Lately an English gentleman, trading in China, had to call on an opulent native merchant on urgent business. The servant denied his master at first; but, on being pressed, confessed that he was still a-bed. Told that he must be seen, he consented to awake him; and after a time the Chinese staggered into the room, yawning, listless, half awake, half alive, obviously incapable of any exertion, mental or corporeal. With difficulty made aware that the matter was important, and that an effort to rouse himself was necessary, he begged to retire for a little; and after a short delay he reappeared, a new creature; clean, well dressed, lively, intelligent, wide awake. *He had employed the interval in smoking his first pipe for the day.*

Or again it may be objected that such sinister results occur only under "excess." We reply—first, that every swallowing of a medicinal agent, of such powers as the narcotic, when not required by morbid or other necessity, is an excess; and secondly, that though, no doubt, the untoward results we speak of are most marked when the dose is large, as well as frequently repeated, yet the minor dose implies not any change in the character of the result, but only in its degree. As we see in other things. A full dose of tartar emetic causes full vomiting; a less, sickness short of that; a less, squeamishness, with perspiration; a less, discomfort still, though less troublesome. All the doses nauseate, more or less; the amount of the dose, the susceptibility of the patient, and the nature of the disease, determining the nausea's degree.

So it is with alcoholics. To the healthy—in God's providence without need of them—their unnecessary, conventional, luxurious use, even within the range of what is called "moderation," is evil as regards both body and mind; giving truth and point to the wise injunction of the poet—

> "Far hence be Bacchus' gifts!
> Inflaming wine, pernicious to mankind—
> *Unnerves the limbs, and dulls the noble mind*—
> Let chiefs abstain?" *

* A certain reverend divine, on a recent public occasion, declared himself at a loss which to admire most, the feasting or the fighting of

III. The Moral Condition.

Conscience, with the *emotions.* With the trifling exception of a spurious semblance of brotherly kindness and charity, little raised above maudlin sentimentalism —capricious, fitful, evanescent—the effects on the moral nature are injurious. All that savours of truth and uprightness is specially impaired. In the habitual drunkard and tippler, indeed, the element of truth is almost, or absolutely extinguished—eaten out by the alcohol, as colour is eaten out of cloth by acid. The man, in that respect, ultimately may rank as a moral

the ancient heroes, more especially those of Homer. It were well that he looked into his classics a little more fully, and had other reminiscences of them, than merely the social and hilarious. No doubt the translator in the above quotation has taken some liberty with the original, and used freely the *licentia poetarum;* still, on turning to the Homeric page, we find enough to show that some modern opinions, as regards the matter of feasting, happen to be considerably below the level of pagan prudence and morality. Hector's mother, pressing wine upon her son, returned from the battle, says—"Refresh thyself, if thou wilt drink; for wine greatly increases the strength of a man weary, as thou art now weary fighting for thy friends." "Bring not the sweet wine to me, my venerable mother," is Hector's reply, "lest thou unnerve me, and I lose my strength and resolution." (Iliad vi. 260-5.)

It were well, too, to remember the fate of Alexander the Great—greatest "fighter" of them all; triumphant and prosperous, till he became wine's abject slave; and then entering on a downward career of disgrace and infamy—to die of *delirium tremens.*

idiot.* He may speak the truth accidentally, not otherwise; and he lies with the utmost ease and comfort to himself, being truly insensible to either its sin or shame. I have known a young gentleman (?), of most respectable connections, and himself most fair to look upon externally, at one time rob his sister of her scanty pocket money, and at another steal twopence from the cook, to buy his driblet of brandy; subsequently denying both meannesses, with all the solemnity of a judge, and with all the dignity of offended innocence. I have known a merchant-prince, once the very soul of honour, but whose inner man had slowly, yet surely, sustained utter alcoholic erosion, insult his wife, betray his friend, blend falsehood and perjury in a breath; and all to cloak his darling sin. I have known clergymen, unhappy victims of this terrible "lust which wars against the soul," protest, even in the hour of inebriety, their absolute soberness, "fasting from all but sin." That poor brother, to whom I have already alluded (p. 30), had promised faithfully to abjure all forms of strong drink, convinced, by my assurance, that otherwise there was no hope for his cure; in tears, and with manifold expressions of truest penitence, he pledged himself to abstinence. At his next visit he was drunk. Taxed with

* "Alcohol: its Place and Power," pp. 128, 132.

the fact, he denied it roundly; and, calling God to witness, protested that he had tasted nothing stronger than water. The case was hopeless; both he and I felt it to be so; we parted silently; and I have seen him no more. He may still be staggering towards the drunkard's grave, or he may have found it—all the more likely to be soon reached, from the circumstance of the hounds of justice being on his track, as I afterwards learned, on account of dishonesty in the handling of those very funds which he had perilled the life of body and soul to realize. Dishonesty, falsehood, perjury! What a terrible inroad the alcoholics had made in the moral nature of this minister of the gospel of Christ! What a sad career! entered on through inadvertence, and culminating in tragedy of the deepest dye.

Listen to the biographer of Coleridge, speaking of his "inveterate and injurious habits—producing, for many years, accumulation of bodily suffering that wasted the frame, poisoned the sources of enjoyment, entailed (in the long retinue of ills) dependence and poverty, and, with all these, associated that which was far less bearable—an intolerable mental load that scarcely knew cessation." Or take his own terrible words—"Conceive a poor miserable wretch, who for many years has been attempting to beat off pain by a constant recurrence to the vice that reproduces it.

Conceive a spirit in hell, employed in tracing out for others the road to that heaven from which his crimes exclude him! In short, conceive whatever is most wretched, helpless, and hopeless, and you will form as tolerable a notion of my state as it is possible for a good man to have. I used to think the text in St James, that 'he who offends in one point, offends in all,' very harsh, but I now feel the awful, the tremendous truth of it. In the one crime of OPIUM, what crime have I not made myself guilty of? Ingratitude to my Maker! and to my benefactors, injustice! and *unnatural cruelty to my poor children!* self-contempt for my repeated promise-breach, nay, too often actual falsehood! After my death, I earnestly entreat that a full and unqualified narration of my wretchedness, and of its guilty cause, may be made public, that, at least, some little good may be effected by the direful example."

Another confirmed and well-known opium eater, of great literary repute, has lately passed on to his account. The periodical press, in their obituary notices, seemed to vie with each other in commendation of his general character and personal virtues. We trembled for the truth. But at length one editor more honest, or better informed than his fellows, spoke out; and, on public grounds, right thankful were we then to read, what we knew to be true, that the stern laws of nature

had not failed even in his instance. A disposition originally loving and kind, gentle and generous, honest and sincere, had yielded under the pressure of the drug; and his moral being, if not absolutely broken, was found bent and bowed in sad deformity.

But these are extreme cases, it is said. Excess, great excess, produces such results—not so the temperate use. As before, we admit the plea as to degree, but not as to kind. The *tendency* and *character* of the effect is the same in all; it is the amount only that varies.

Sorrowful illustrations of this may be seen, all too often, in medical practice. A patient has been ordered the daily use of opium, for disease apparently requiring it. But unfortunately the dose is not made to cease with the necessity for it, and the patient, finding it a luxury, continues it on—often clandestinely. The amount may never be large, but the substance taken is narcotic and unneeded; and the result, after a time, will invariably be found deteriorating to the moral element. The patient becomes peevish, irritable, selfish, and exacting, wayward in fancies and affection, morbid in every feeling, less and less careful of truth; and cunning and deceit may often grow so strong, as quite to eclipse the remnants of a previously good and even generous nature. One aged clergyman, I remember, a good and godly man, had fallen into this

snare. Long he had been a "moderate" opium eater, unknown to all his family. Night after night his little phial of morphia was hidden beneath his pillow; and when detected, he sailed more closely in the eye of false denial than became his profession and his years.

Is it safe to use, in any degree, that which, while it depresses and deteriorates the moral element, intensifies the animal, and weakens, more or less, the power of self-control? Is it right, at the bidding of appetite, or in subjection to prejudice and custom, to use, as a luxury, that which renders the user more of a mere animal, and less of a man?*

IV. The Spiritual Condition.

This is still more directly and decidedly interfered with. Imagination, properly so called—the only mental element which the drug seems really to enhance—has little to do with true religion. And

* "Alcohol: its Place and Power," p. 131. Old Pagan morality may teach us a lesson here. "Some of the Grecian sages allowed no more than three cups; one for health, a second for cheerfulness, and a third for sleep. Panyasis allowed no more than the second cup; the first to the Graces, Hours, and Bacchus, the second to Venus and Bacchus. They who proceeded to the third cup, according to that author, dedicated it to Lust and Strife. Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, prohibited *unnecessary drinking*, which debilitates both body and mind; and ordered that *no man should drink for any other purpose than to satisfy his thirst.*" Most wise lawgiver!

even if it had, whence comes the *inspiration* of such religious thoughts and actions as follow the alcoholic stimulus? "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is ἀσωτια; *but be filled with the Spirit.*" And is a man whose power of mental control is lessened, even in any degree, by a voluntary act of sensual indulgence —whose carnal man is stimulated, and whose play of fancy is freed of let and hindrance—in such a state as to invoke or invite the breathings of The Spirit, or make his nature more impressible when they come? God seeks man's "heart," his whole mental state, but specially his understanding and affections; and man must not mar these, by his own hand, wantonly, if he would hope for God's blessing thereupon.

Some opponents have gone so far as to assert that "the Gospel finds access more readily to the heart of the drunkard in his helpless simplicity, and ever recurring remorse, than to that of the abstinent who is apt to be puffed up in self-sufficiency and spiritual pride." What a slur is this on divine truth! in supposing it to be more suited to the excited imagination and obtuse reason of the sensualist, than to the clear and cool mind of the temperate and self-controlled!

The tendency of the drug, taken unnecessarily, is continually and decidedly to counteract and deaden the movements of the spiritual nature, both as regards the man's own personal condition, and the outgoings of

that upon others; *more or less*, as has been often said, according to the amount taken, and the susceptibility of the individual. Instances of this might be given at great length. One or two must suffice—An eminent clergyman resolved to give up his daily glass or two of wine, long used as a mere custom; and at the end of some months he could look back on a greater freedom, and elasticity, and equableness of his spiritual nature. An honoured evangelist, in labours oft, was wont to strengthen himself by a daily temperate use of alcoholics. At my advice he gave them up—as it happened, not for any other than a corporal reason. "How did you preach?" I asked, when next seeing him. "Well, for the first time in my life, I came to a stop from having nothing more to say." "But did you say all that you had arranged and intended to say?" "Yes, and never so clearly." "Then you stopped from want of thoughts suggesting themselves at the time?" "Yes." "Then *whence*, think you, came the thoughts on former occasions? Try again; and, depend upon it, you will not only say all you purpose, clearly and well, but thoughts worth the having will come uncalled for too." And so it fared; in preaching he found himself improved, as to body, mind, and spirit; less fatigued, more clear, more spiritual. After three months of Nephalism, his testimony was this—"Healthier in body, clearer in mind,

and above all, able to trust myself now to write upon the most sacred subjects at any time of the day, which I would not formerly have done after a couple of glasses of sherry." After twelve months' further trial, he writes again—"*I am sure* my bodily health is better; I believe my mind to be fully as vigorous; and I have far more confidence now in the *source* from which my spiritual light is derived, than I had when I was taking habitually my two glasses of sherry, or the same number of tumblers of Bass's bitter beer."

Dr Channing, after having given up his wine, declared that a cloud had passed away from his soul. And Dr Pye Smith, dealing with the question in more general terms, makes this most pregnant statement, in reference to the habitual use of alcoholics, in any freedom. "The person becomes insusceptible of pure religious feelings, and is awfully liable to spurious religion—the religion of self-flattery, the religion of exaltation, of imagined privileges, while moral obligations are little regarded—the religion whose spiritual character is spiritual pride and vain-glorious confidence. This pretended religion—the most virulent of moral poisons—the most deceptive to its own victims, and the most contagious to other persons—is well known to the faithful minister as the hydra evil which occasions the greatest difficulties, and most distressing

trials in all his course of duty. Close investigation will often discover a surprising connection between these delusions of the soul and the indulgence, very moderately, in spirituous beverages and narcotic poisons."

A middle-aged man lay dying of lingering disease. He had been a sceptic all his life, till about three months before. Up till then his strong subtle intellect could not brook the simplicity of the gospel. Now he was hungering and thirsting for it, as a little child. To prevent rapid sinking, it was thought necessary to give alcoholics freely; and he took them, with his other drugs. But one night, he whispered into my ear, with an earnestness I shall never forget—"Don't ask me to take so much wine and brandy; without them I pass my sleepless nights in silent prayer, or in otherwise communing with my God and Saviour; with them my mind wanders and is disturbed, and often will settle on nothing but the trifles and vanities of this world, from which I am so fast passing away." The prescription had been wrong as to amount; and the law of tolerance had been overpassed accordingly.

We might look back, too, into ancient history; contrasting, for example, the spiritual life of Samuel with that of David, Daniel with Solomon. But we must be content with one instance more; and that shall be from a humble walk in the present day.

"A labourer said to me one day," writes Mrs Wightman, "I never get the headache now, and I sleep like a baby o' nights. *I feel my head clear for God, and for my earthly master; and that's more than I could ever say before.*" "Well, well," says some one, "that was one of the drunken navvies; no wonder." "Nay," continues Mrs Wightman—"*This man was not a drunkard.*"

Even in "moderation," this *luxury* is not safe for the inner man of the Christian.* It reminds one greatly of good John Bunyan's saying as to another snare—"It hindereth them in their pilgrimage."†

* One of whose features is thus sketched off by Bishop Hall in his "full-length portrait" of him "—whose diet is regulated by health, not by pleasure, as one whose table shall be no altar to his belly, *nor snare to his soul.*"

† "Then I saw in my dream that a little off the road over against the silver mine, stood Demas (gentlemanlike) to call passengers to come and see; who said to Christian and his fellow, Ho, turn aside hither and I will shew you a thing.

"*Chr.*—What thing so deserving as to turn us out of the way to see it?

"*Demas.*—Here is a silver mine, and some digging in it for treasure; if you will come, with a little pains you may richly provide for yourselves.

"*Hope.*—Then said Hopeful, Let us go see.

"*Chr.*—Not I, said Christian; I have heard of this place before now, and how many have there been slain; and besides, that treasure is a snare to those that seek it, for it hindereth them in their pilgrimage.

It is no argument against the preceding statements to allege, that maudlin drunkenness sometimes assumes the form of religion; that while one man is "greetin' fou," another may be "praying drunk." We have heard of one father of a family, indeed, who never summoned his domestic circle to prayer, except when he came home intoxicated. And what was this, but Satan playing with the poor fool's imagination, and torturing it to his own fiendish ends? Engaging him in the grossest impiety, alike dishonouring to God, and destructive to his own soul.

This suggests the consideration, whether the mental, moral, and spiritual results of unnecessary indulgence in alcoholics, as observed by the physiologist, and as we have endeavoured to state them, be borne out by reference to the only infallible standard—"The Law and the Testimony." I can only say that the more I study the Bible, the more satisfied am I, through its teaching, of the truth of the physiological and psychological statements here made. I do not attempt anything like a complete collocation of texts in support, but must content myself with a few—as a part, not as a whole.

"Then Christian called to Demas, saying, Is not the place dangerous? hath it not hindered many in their pilgrimage?

"*Demas.*—Not very dangerous, except to those that are careless. But withal he blushed as he spake."

On perception, memory, judgment, and conscience. "Lest they drink and *forget* the law, and *pervert the judgment* of any of the afflicted." Prov. xxxi. 5. "They also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the people have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink (what strength in these repetitions!) they *err in vision, they stumble in judgment.*" Is. xxviii. 7. "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink; which *justify the wicked for reward,* and *take away the righteousness of the righteous from him.*" Is. v. 22, 23.

On the passions and instincts. "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is *raging.*" Prov. xx. 1. "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may swallow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine *inflame* them, ... they regard not the work of the Lord, *neither consider the operation of his hands.*" Is. v. 11, 12. "Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath *contentions?* who hath *babbling?* who hath *wounds without cause?* who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine. *Thine eyes shall behold strange women,* and *thine heart shall utter perverse things.*" Prov. xxiii. 29, 30, 33.

Once more it may be objected, It is "excess" and

long continuance that is denounced here; may not a "little" be inferred wholesome and safe? We incline to think not. For out of the centre of this last passage (v v. 31, 32) we extract the solemn injunction—"*Look not thou upon the wine (look* not, even, on it), when it is red, when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright (fermentation implied, says the chemist*). At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder."

Such passages surely throw a flood of light on the physiological fact, that alcohol acts directly and chemically on the brain, always: and in almost all cases with injurious reaction on the whole mental estate, when taken without medicinal excuse and necessity. Do they not give at the same time much point and force to the apostolic injunction, "Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims,† abstain from *those* fleshly lusts which (ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες) *war against the* ψυχη." (1 Peter ii. 11.) And do we not find a deep emphasis in the

* The literal translation of this passage given in Kitto's Encyclopædia of Biblical Literature is still more expressive:—"Look not thou upon the wine when it is turbid, when it giveth its bubble in the cup, moving itself upward."

† In connection with the condition of "*strangers* and pilgrims," see the injunction to the Rechabites, Jerem. xxxv. 7.

injunction of Paul, "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is ἀσωτια:" (Eph. v. 18)—insufficiently translated "excess," but having a meaning far wider and deeper than this: ἀσωτος, the abandoned, profligate, desperate, *perditus:* ἀσωτια, the sad and degraded condition of such an one.*

And now the question naturally arises—If this be so, surely the Word, the Directory of man's life, will speak out, and guard against this evil? We think it does; and not ambiguously. The New Testament is full of great *principles*, from which the duty of abstinence from all intoxicants, as food or luxuries, is to be deduced, in regard to both ourselves and others. Such is our conviction, at least. And had that been all, we should have held it quite sufficient for our personal guidance, on grounds which will afterwards be stated. But, besides, in such passages as the following, we see something more than mere inference.

"It is not for *kings*, O Lemuel, it is not for *kings* to drink wine; nor for princes strong drink; lest they drink and forget the law (a mental effect), and pervert the judgment (a moral effect), of any of the afflicted. Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let

* Augustine says in regard to drunkenness—"Whosoever doth commit it, committeth not a single sin, but becomes the centre and the slave of all manner of sin."

him drink and *forget* his poverty, and *remember* his misery no more." (Prov. xxxi. 4.-7.) Drugs may be given to such a man, as indeed was the custom in the case of criminals suffering at the hands of justice; and it need cause no great surprise if such abjects themselves seek to purchase a temporary Lethe thus. But *kings* and *princes* are not to drink wine or strong drink; and that for reasons connected with the effects on both mind and morals.

Nadab and Abihu have been intemperate, and neglected their charge in the priesthood; the sacred fire has gone out; they have "offered strange fire before the Lord," and they have been consumed. In consequence of this *one* offence, the edict goes forth addressed to Aaron—"Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and *that ye may put difference between holy and unholy* (spiritual perception) and *between clean and unclean;* and *that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes* which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses." Levit. x. 9, 11. *Priests*, like kings, are interdicted from all intoxicants, when offering sacrifice. The interdict is founded on mental and moral effects; and with this special reason annexed, that they may have clear spiritual perception to determine between

holy and unholy, clean and unclean, and be able to teach all the statutes of the Lord.

Is it said—"What have we, in the present day of gospel light and liberty, to do with the ancient dispensation? Will you Judaize?" No: but we ask you to compare things old and new, by turning to the last Book of the New Testament, and reading there—"Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath *made us kings and priests unto God and his Father.*" (Rev. i. 5, 6.) The Christian of the present day is both a king and a priest "unto God;" and as such, may he not be subject to the injunction quoted? But, rejoins the objector, the interdict applies to the priest, only when he "goes into the tabernacle of the congregation." Turn, then, to 1 Peter ii. 5—"Ye also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, *an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices*, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." *Continually* offering up sacrifice, not of atonement, for that was "finished," for ever, once on Calvary—but of praise and thanksgiving; "presenting your *bodies* a *living sacrifice*, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." (Rom. xii. 1.) And again, "Ye are a chosen generation, a *Royal priesthood* (Kings and Priests), an holy nation, a peculiar people Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from (the)

fleshly lusts which war against the soul," 1 Peter ii. 9, 11. And, still farther, in the fourth chapter of the same Epistle, at the third verse, the followers of Christ are enjoined to abstain, not only from "excess of wine" (οἰνοφλυγίαις) and from revellings (κώμοις), but also from "banquetings" (πότοις, literally, drinkings.) It may be said that the Apostle is here referring, not to ordinary domestic drinkings, but to the set *drinking bouts* not uncommon at this time among a certain class of the Greeks, men meeting together systematically for the purpose of drinking, and almost always drinking to excess. Be it so. We are not the less convinced that it was in the Apostle's mind to debar his followers not only from such obviously sinful indulgences, but also from *all unnecessary drinkings* of strong drink, seeing that he adds in the seventh verse—"But the end of all things is at hand; be ye therefore sober (σωφρονήσατε) and watch (νήψατε, literally, drink not*) unto prayer." What more fatal to the sentinel's efficiency than strong drink? Vision not so clear;

* I do not assert—it is not necessary that I should—that the absolutely literal meaning of the word is intended here—never drinking wine or strong drink under any circumstances; but I maintain, that out of that word's use, in the connexion, the intelligent, lively, conscientious Christian will find abstinence in the present day from the *luxurious* use of strong drink most certainly implied.

imagination excited; drowsiness coming on. This is no safe attitude for the soldier of the cross. "What I say unto you, *I say unto all, Watch!*"

Once more—"Be sober; be vigilant!" (1 Peter v. 8.) Νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε. Does this counsel, addressed more particularly to young men, in whom the lusts of the flesh specially tend to prevail, not point to something more thorough than the conventional "sobriety" of the present day? Νήφω, we know, has its two meanings; literally, "I am sober because I do not drink," or, "because I do not drink that which impairs my vigilance or clearness of discernment;" metaphorically, "I am wide awake and wary—in a general sense, without reference to drink." Take the word by itself, and it may have either meaning; according to the context. But put it beside a word, or words, which necessarily convey the metaphorical meaning; and is it not then to be inferred that the literal interpretation is that which is intended? When we find "νήψατε" put beside "σωφρονήσατε" at one time, and beside "γρηγορήσατε" at another—each of these other words conveying the metaphorical meaning of νήφω—I cannot resist the conclusion, that a direct injunction of Nephalism is implied; as plainly as in this other,—"Look not thou on the wine when it is red!" The Bible deals not in vain repetitions.

"Therefore let us not sleep as do others, but let us

watch and be sober (γρηγορῶμεν και νήφωμεν). For they that sleep, sleep in the night, and they that be *drunken* are *drunken* in the night. But let us who are of the day *be sober*—νηφωμεν!" 1 Thess. v. 6-8.

And our duty is, not only to watch, but to *fight.* In every renewed man there is still "as it were the company of two armies," with an unceasing contention for the mastery between—the flesh and the spirit; the carnal man and the renewed man; "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh—and these are contrary the one to the other." In fighting that fight, if we would be good soldiers, it must be "a good fight." And how can it be a good fight, or even an honest one, if, in entering on it, we wilfully and wantonly, in the indulgence of natural desires, or in obedience to the fashion of the world, do that—it may be systematically and freely—which not only strengthens the flesh, but weakens the spirit? Not only fostering (more or less) that, whose "works" are "adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like;" (shutting out the doer of them from "inheriting the kingdom of God;") but also repressing, perverting, neutralising the "works" of the other "army"—"love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness,

temperance," (ἐγκράτεια, *absolute self-control* in all things); these are "the fruit of the Spirit," and "against such there is no law." Galatians v. 19.

"Holding with the hare, and running with the hounds," is a common and expressive proverb, that no good man would brook the application of to his own dealings with his fellows. How shall we endure its force, if true in relation to our dealings with God, professing to fight on the side of the Spirit, yet all the while opposing that power, and strengthening the enemy?

And once more the figure varies. There is to be a contending for the Prize in the arena, as well as for the victory in the field. We are not only to watch and fight, but also to *strive;* always walking, sometimes running, sometimes wrestling. Besides keeping ourselves in a state of wakefulness, in circumstances favourable to fighting "a good fight," we are to be in condition fit for contending as gymnasts. This "condition" we cannot have, unless by "*training*." "Know ye not, that they which run in a race, run all, but one receiveth the prize? *So* run that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery, *is temperate in all things* (πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται—translated by Conybeare, "*training* himself by all manner of self-restraint"). This direct allusion to the Isthmian games is very plain, and cannot fail to evoke conside-

ration of the system of "training" then in use. We have already seen, in the quotation from Horace (p. 25), of what the dietary did *not* consist; and we know that, from that day to this, the most successful trainers either absolutely, or almost, continue the system of Nephalism. The result is favourable not to the body only, but to the mind also; equanimity of temper* being conjoined with full development of strength, and perfect health, or "condition." And is not the negation of such "luxuries" implied here? If these men so act to obtain a "corruptible crown"—the fading laurel of the victor—shall not we do likewise, in view of an "incorruptible?" The Judge who gives that crown, is the "righteous Judge" (II Tim. iv. 8), and will He not have regard to the faithfulness and honesty of the contenders?

In what does that faithfulness consist? What is the object of the contention—the race, the wrestle, the fight? The keeping of the law of the Lord. For this the "crown of righteousness" is the fitting reward.

And in what consists the Law of God? Two great commandments: First—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind." But

* The man that loses his temper in the ring, may be pretty certain of losing the battle too.

who can keep this? "Who then can be saved?" "With men it is impossible, but not with God." And, accordingly, in His condescension it assumes another form—"*This is His commandment:* that we should believe on the name of his Son, Jesus Christ." (1 John iii. 23.) These two injunctions constitute the first and greatest commandment. If I believe that the Son of God died for me, that the Father sent him, that the Spirit enables me to embrace the salvation so given and so procured, I cannot help loving the triune Jehovah with the whole force of my loving power.

To believe savingly on the Lord Jesus Christ, implies the surrender of my heart entirely to him. And how can this be, if I wantonly mar its entirety by sensual, luxurious indulgence of appetite, or even through heedlessness and neglect? As I am required to *love*, so am I called to *believe*, with *all* my *heart* (ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας — with all my *affections*), with *all* my *soul* (ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς), with *all* my *strength* (ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος— with the whole force of my *will*), and with *all* my *mind*—(ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας—with *all* the powers of my *understanding*). What a care to include every portion of my acting and thinking nature! And what a force in the repetition, at each enumeration, "*With all!*"

Does science teach, and observation prove, that the

unnecessary indulging in opium, alcohol, and similar narcotics, tends to injure, and does injure, more or less (I care not how little or how much, for the sake of the argument), all the agencies by which my God demands that I love and serve him, in their entire bulk and force? Then the conclusion seems to me inevitable, that by such indulgence, *I render myself incapable of keeping that greatest and first commandment.* True God-service has become impossible to me, under my own wilful act. This is sin. And my duty is, to cease from such self-injury; so that, through God's blessing, the mutilated parts of my better nature may grow again, becoming anew developed in healthful exercise, and at length enabling me once more to offer a *whole heart* to my Saviour and my God.

In connection with this, it is important to remark here—what is becoming more and more generally admitted by thinking men—that great though the sin of "drunkenness" be, that is not the only evil, and perhaps not the main evil, arising from the unnecessary use of alcoholics.* As the phrase is commonly understood, (bestial intoxication, something extreme, and intensely degrading) drunkenness is a heinous sin and offence, doubtless, in the sight of God and man; and many a sad evil both attends and

* Alcohol: Its Place and Power," p. 131.

follows it, to the offender and to his fellows. But a condition very decidedly short of what the world ordinarily calls "drunkenness" is still more perilous to all concerned. It is from human beings *thus* affected—in what may be in one sense termed a minor degree of intoxication, that uncleanness, violence, theft, robbery, murder—crimes of every kind and degree—take their pernicious and prolific rise: not from the paralytic, helpless, idiotic beast that lies wallowing in the kennel; but from the fiercer beast roaming the streets or fields, with all his animal passions roused and intensified, and with the little mental and moral control he ever had departed. "There is scarcely a crime comes before me that is not directly or indirectly caused by strong drink," says a judge of assize. "Nine-tenths of the crime that is committed, and nearly all the poverty and wretchedness of the poor man's dwelling, may be attributed to drink," says a Lord Mayor of London. And similar testimony from the highest and best authorities may be accumulated *ad infinitum.*

Let it never be forgotten that a fertile source of the personal, domestic, social evil—physical and moral—that hangs like a sable pall over our land, is found in a vicious use of intoxicants far short of what men ordinarily call drunkenness; short of what the law recognises as a crime; short of what the church

holds fatal to its membership; short of what society deems extrusive from its pale.*

But, at the same time, words ought to have this definite meaning. And it is of vast importance that we should be able to give a distinct answer to the questions—What is drunkenness? and When is a man drunk? For practical ends, to deal with the latter will suffice.

Those who are fond of their own cups are prone to pitch the definition high; and often we find them liberal in small wit upon the occasion, gravely announcing, perhaps, that a man is not drunk so long as he can refrain from attempting to light his pipe at the pump, or so long as he can lie in the gutter, on his back, without holding with both hands on the curb-stone. Nephalists, again, are alleged to place the *vinculum* low, inclusive of too wide a range of unnecessary libations. In either case, we deem it somewhat of a blunder to attempt any positive statement on the matter. The safe and the right method

* An intelligent engineer lately assured me of his conviction that while the greater number of railway accidents are certainly attributable to the effects of drink, the men could not be convicted of actual drunkenness at the time of the offence. The driver gets a spur into his head, and in consequence becomes rash and careless; he is intent on speed, and contemns precaution. Suddenly the crash comes, and if he survive, the shock and excitement banish all trace of the drinking. In the esteem of his fellows, the man is sober. Still it was drink that did it.

is a negative one; simple, searching, true. *When a man ceases to be sober, he is drunk.* When, through indulgence in what he knows has the power to intoxicate, his perception and memory are rendered inaccurate, or even uncertain—while the reasoning faculty is confused, and the power of the will, or self-control, impaired, irrespective of the attendant sinister effects on the emotions and the conscience—the man has ceased to be sober, and is guilty of drunkenness; a condition of various degrees, of course, according to circumstances. Such is the logical conclusion; and we know it to be consistent with the infallible code of the Scriptures. To bring me under the doom of the Sixth Commandment, it is not essential that I should absolutely slay my brother; it is enough that I be angry with him without a cause. To underlie breach of the Seventh, it is not essential that I complete the act of uncleanness; if I have looked upon a woman to lust after her, I have committed adultery in the heart.

A man may be sober in the eyes of his fellow-men, and to speak of him as otherwise might readily be set down as calumny and slander, who nevertheless is not sober when tested by the standard which alone is infallible. "The Lord seeth not as man seeth, for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on *the heart*."

Take an example. A medical man is dining out. He has had a fair allowance of wine, such as any man may take in the present day, and never be suspected of being at all "the worse" for it. But although he know it not, it so happens that his imagination is excited, his memory is a little awry, perception and conception are neither of them quite accurate, and his reasoning faculty is somewhat uncertain and obscure. Suddenly he is called to a case, at once of greatest delicacy and extremest need. Life is hanging in the balance, and but a little make-weight will suffice to determine either way. Something must be done, and that at once, to admit even of hope; but to determine what that something shall be, requires coolness, skill, and clearness of intellectual working. Is he in a condition duly to exercise these qualities; to summon his experience, to reason on it truly, to determine on it justly, and to adapt it to the exigencies of the case which he has acutely and accurately observed? Then he is sober. But if not—if in any degree he be defective, through the influence of the narcotic—then he is drunk, in the sight of God.

Or, suppose a clergyman under similar circumstances. Take him from the table where he has enjoyed himself, so far as the verge of "moderation" will allow. Ask him at once to engage in prayer—leading, perhaps, the devotions of a multitude. He

may find himself in fit frame for at once holding high and holy converse with his God, and directing his own thoughts and feelings, as well as those of others, in their due channel to the throne of grace. If so, all is well. But it may be otherwise. "Strange fire" may be offered. Or if conscience be tender, embarrassment and confusion may occur; and the duty, felt to be unsuitable, may be conscientiously declined. Is that man sober? Or summon him at once to a sick-bed, where some dying man is struggling with the temptations of the Evil One, and the weakness and wickedness of his own heart; clutching anxiously at the cross, but ever beaten back by some enemy from without or from within; feeling but never touching; hoping but never realizing. There is a doubt, and it must be dissipated; there is a difficulty, and it must be taken away; there is a fear, and it must be cast out; the turning point may be one of greatest delicacy, requiring caution, tact, experience, perspicuity, coolness, in the handling. Minutes are flying fast, and but a few of these will suffice to reckon all the remaining space of life now. There is no time for delay: action must be instant. Is the "ambassador for Christ" capable of undertaking this mission at once, with all his qualifications, personal and professional, unmodified and unmarred? Then he is safe; and the winning of that soul may be a jewel in his

coming crown. If not, he is drunk—in the sight of God.

These statements may seem harsh, and even rude. But the question is, not as to their generosity, but as to their justice. Are they true? Are we not bound, in the consideration of this question, to give to the words "drunk" and "drunkenness" a far more extensive range and meaning than they ordinarily receive?

But, to bring this part of our argument to a close—From what has been stated, are we not entitled to advocate earnestly the claims of Nephalism *on personal grounds?* To begin with the lowest motive; *pecuniarily* the man is benefited. The expenses of the alcoholic superfluities having been removed, a greater range will be given to the necessaries of life; no slight matter to most people, but specially important to the masses of our working men. Take the amount annually spent by each on alcoholics, even in "moderation," and let any Chancellor of the Exchequer propose to lay it on, as an income tax—not to meet any real necessity of expenditure, as in national defence, or sanitary reform, but to spend in fireworks, spectacles, fetes, and other items of national amusement and frivolity. What a commotion! what a hue and cry! what a fierce and indignant agitation from John O' Groat's to Land's End! But the Chancellor

is deaf to all entreaty and remonstrance; he must have his revenue; and the tax is imposed, and levied inexorably. Riot and revolution may be staved off; but what murmurings and heart-burning among the people! what pamphleteering! what monster-indignation-meetings! what terrible resolutions and debates! At length the matter grows intolerable; the popular voice finds echo in the senate; a vote of "no confidence" is carried; the obnoxious Chancellor and his colleagues are turned out; their successors come in, pledged to repeal; they are as good as their word; the hated tax is swept away, the nation is grateful and glad—the people jubilant exceedingly.

"Every man his own chancellor!" Wise men will do for themselves, when they have it in their power, what another might only *perhaps* do for them.

Safer and better for the purse, Nephalism is safer and better for the *person*—the *body*. Other things being equal, strength will be greater, and health will be better. We shall be strong enough for the effort of work, and in such "condition" as to be able to sustain it, not only with impunity, but with advantage.

Safer and better for the purse and for the body, Nephalism is safer and better for the *mind*. Imagination may be less vivid at times; but what there is, is real; not flashing and fitful, or refusing to come when called—perhaps when most wanted—but steady and

continuous; *semper parata.* Perception, conception, memory, understanding, are all more sharp and more true.

Safer and better for the purse, for the body, and for the mind, Nephalism is safer and better for the *moral nature.* Conscience is unseared, and self-control unimpaired.

Safer and better for purse, body, mind, morals, Nephalism is safer and better for the *Spiritual Nature.* The "flesh" is not helped; the emotions are not borne earthwards; the will is free. "Loose him and let him go, that he may serve Me."

There is a hideous chasm that men have to cross daily. Beneath, is a deep and miry slough, where myriads are tumbling in, to welter in slime and misery. Some few crawl out, and may grow clean again after a time; but a fearful majority perish for ever. Bridging this chasm, there is a *plank;* narrow, slippery, elastic, without a rope or hand-rail. On this the practised few may pass, and repass, in safety; yet ever and anon even they may slip and fall; and at the best, the anxious footing tells unfavourably on the muscles, and joints; in strains, and halts, and weaknesses. After no long time, the most expert get "out of drawing in their limbs," more or less; and find themselves "hindered in their pilgrimage." There is a pontage, too; somewhat costly in its exactions.

A little lower down there is a *bridge;* strong and substantial; without swerve or vibration; parapetted on either side. The footing is firm; the young, the weak, the lame, the blind, may pass in safety. There is no room for accident; only by a wilful act of self-immolation can one reach the chasm beneath. And there is no toll; the thoroughfare is absolutely free.

The plank may be most in fashion, however, and the crossing there may be looked upon as a better style of going—more "gentlemanly," say some—more becoming even a Christian's walk, say others, (though strangely). Dangerous, no doubt, for the multitude; and requiring care and circumspection, as well as practice, on the part of even the Blondins of humanity. The bridge! any one could cross there; it requires no agility or skill; and to prefer that, moreover, would positively imply not only a confession of one's own clumsiness, but also a distrust of God's promise and protection. Besides, it is vulgar. "The plank suits me. Let others go where they please."

Friend! Which is the Sixth Commandment? "Thou shalt not kill." And out of that springs this other, "Do thyself *no* harm." You may pick your steps across that narrow and slippery foot-way, without falling, but you can never avoid a certainty of some injury in the daily strain, with risk of graver accident, perhaps, when least expected. Men as good as you

have lost their footing ere now. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall!" "Be not high-minded, but fear."

And what of those less expert, immortals like yourself, who, following your example, fall and perish? Are your hands clear of their blood? or is its voice even now crying to heaven against you from the ground? "That is their affair, not mine," do you say? "Let every man mind his own business?" Nay, brother, that may serve the worldling for a maxim; but such is not the way God puts it. "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's."

Go by the bridge then, and let the plank alone. The bridge is safe for you, and safe for all.

I have besought you, in one argument, for your own sake, based on the first of the Great commandments—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind." There is a second, which is like unto it—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." On that rests a second argument, which I propose now to discuss briefly.

Nephalism advocated on Public Grounds.

—o—

It is needless here to enter on the extent of intemperance, or on the nature and number of its evil results. We may assume that this sin and crime (for no one, we suppose, except perhaps an occasional town councillor, doubts that it is both) is acknowledged as our national bondage and disgrace—to a large extent "the mother of sins," and parent to boot of nine-tenths of our poverty, misery, and crime.

Its causes are many, and its cures are many. That is to say, while there is but one cure for this and all other sin, *the heart cure*—the grace of God renewing the affections, understanding, and will, even as there is but one main root of the evil, the evil heart that is in every man by nature—there are many auxiliary means proportioned to the many auxiliary roots, which may and ought to be employed to compass the great end in view.

To borrow a professional illustration. An old dislocation of a joint is reduced by pulling, or mechanical force: but the skilful surgeon does not trust to that alone. There are "auxiliary means"—as chloroform, warm bath, opium, whereby the resisting power of the muscles may be first relaxed, and the reduction consequently rendered much more easy, to both the surgeon and the patient. So in the moral displacement of "the heart," reduction is only to be effected by the Spirit's power—this alone can pull it back; yet God has pointed out auxiliary means to that end, which He has both said and shown that He will bless. To use these, faithfully, zealously, intelligently, and skilfully, is both our duty and our privilege.

Paul was a great preacher of the Gospel. Who greater? Who, among men, so great? Yet he did not undervalue or neglect the "auxiliary means." He used them diligently, and specially such as these of which we are to speak—"To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. *And this I do for the Gospel's sake.*"

All lawful means are to be used towards cure; and it is incumbent on all right men to use them, so far as power and opportunity are given.

Of such means few are more important for the particular purpose now in view, than the *opposing of the*

drinking customs of the country. On these, beyond all doubt, a large amount of our intemperance depends. People's heads, somehow, have got preoccupied with the idea, that nothing can be well done without drinking strong drink. They can't buy, and can't sell; they can't marry, baptize, or bury; they can't mourn, and they can't rejoice; they can't show loyalty, hospitality, patriotism—without partaking more or less freely of intoxicants. As if nothing honest, just, pure, lovely, or of good report—no virtue, nor any praise—were or could be real, but all forced and adventitious: as if "all the world a sham" were not the mere breathing of a cynic, but a sad and stern truth. As things at present stand, a bargain would not hold without strong drink; hospitality would be an affront without it; loyalty, sympathy, kindness would be hypocrisy without it; or, indeed, such things could scarcely exist at all otherwise—at least in any appreciable amount or degree. And so the better parts of our nature have been cleverly cajoled into league with the great enemy of both body and soul. For it is this constant drink, drink, drinking, from youth to old age, Sabbath and Saturday, at kirk and market, in public and private, for every reason and for no reason, that saps the foundations of sobriety in all, and ensnares those fatally whose temperaments and circumstances predispose them specially to this "lust of the flesh."

It is high time that people were made to reflect that drugs are not intended to be swallowed—least of all in any considerable quantity—unless by the sick; and that they cannot be otherwise taken, or given, with impunity. Squeer's establishment obtained no enviable notoriety from the weekly dose of sulphur and treacle served all round. But sulphur is only a simple aperient and alterative; and the practice was quite as sensible, and not so dangerous by half, as the distribution of wine to the boys of a large public Hospital, and pressing it upon their acceptance, on the anniversary of their patron's nativity. This is to identify in their minds the use of strong drink with personal enjoyment, as well with the expression of gratitude to a benefactor and of respect to the great; and so to prop up the drinking customs on a very strong foundation—the habits and ideas of our educated youth.

Nephalism prevailing, the drinking customs will, of necessity, be proportionally broken down. And so, temptation being diminished, many who would otherwise become victims will escape. Separate men and women into two classes—nephalists and temperates (moderate drinkers)—and observe from which class it is that the ranks of the intemperate are recruited. From the latter, all but exclusively.

Some entertain an opposite opinion. They say, "Drink! but drink temperately. Take your glass or

two of beer, or wine, but don't meddle with that horrid whisky; and whatever you do, take all your drink at home; don't enter the public house! By teaching you to drink in moderation, we shall save you from drinking to excess. If you never drink at all, you will find the restraint irksome, and ever be liable to fall into excess, on the principle of reaction; but gratify your appetite for these things, moderately and habitually, and the temptation to excess, at any time, will be lessened thereby." To this there are two fatal objections: 1. It is thus that the *taste for drink*, and the *habit of drinking*, are acquired; and use of the minor (beer or wine) does not exclude that of the major (gin or whisky); on the contrary, the one tends to the other, as readily as if by a law of attraction or gravitation, and specially among the working classes. Drink, drank, *drunk*, is a sequence almost as natural to the social, as to the grammatical arrangement. The non-medicinal use of alcoholics invariably tends to produce an increased and increasing appetite for their consumpt, which can be restrained only by high principle and thorough self-control—and these, being both weakened by the hurtful agents, gradually lose their power; so that, in most cases, the untoward progress of the appetite is ultimately certain. *Vires acquirit eundo.* From little to more; from weak to strong. A few glasses of wine may do to-day; but

double the quantity will be needed by and by. Beer or light wine may satisfy now; but brandy, and other "strong waters," will be in request ere long. "It is cause of lamentation and alarm to philanthropists abroad that the light wines, so much spoken of, no longer satisfy the appetite of the people, who are gradually passing over to the consumption of spirits. M. Ducpetiaux, the inspector of prisons under the Belgian government, and many other gentlemen of large experience, are incessant in their efforts to call public attention to this danger."* The supposed superior sobriety of wine-countries is, indeed, now wholly exploded, and found to be little else than a "mockery, delusion, and snare." 2. This is the most certain of all ways of stereotyping the drinking customs; by founding them on the daily habits of ordinary domestic life.

They say, "Drink, *but keep* sober!" We say, "Don't drink, *and remain* sober!" Their very words imply an inconsistency, and a struggle. Ours, on the other hand, imply a natural and easy sequence of events. "Drink! *but*" *v.* "Don't drink! *and*." "Drink! but *keep*" *v.* "Don't drink! and *remain*." They say, *Enter into* this temptation, so far—but beware!" We say, "*Enter not* into this temptation at all, and you

* Meliora, July, 1860, p. 165.

will be the better able, God helping you, to contend not only with this temptation, but with every temptation."

Νήψατε καὶ γρηγορήσατε! is the divine command; and the Nephalist's translation is a literal one. Of what text the other party have availed themselves, as a counterpart warrant of their system, I am not aware. The nearest approach to anything suitable that I have seen them take is this—"Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." But this looks a very desperate affair. For the supposition that the word "drink" here implies the use of strong or intoxicating drink, in any social, luxurious, or domestic sense—such as is common in the present day—can emanate not from calm reason surely, but from an *imagination excited*, and that in no usual degree. And, for my part, I do not see how any use of narcotics and intoxicants *can* be "*for God's glory*," other than what is consistent with those laws of protection against both physical and moral injury, which He in His providence has ordained.

To break down the drinking customs, and so prevent drunkenness, it is obvious that the power of both numbers and influence is required. Many men and women of all ranks must abstain, habitually: and many men and women, specially, of the higher stations of life must do so—more particularly if well

known not only for their sobriety, but also for talent and general worth. Numbers must be had: but they are not enough alone. Combine with them the influence of the great and the good, and the end is gained. To the many, accordingly, we appeal; for their own sakes, and the sake of others. To the great and good we appeal, with at least equal urgency, on behalf of those less favoured, but whose souls may be equally precious in the sight of God. Make the *bridge* fashionable, as well as safe: then the *plank* will be deserted, and the chasm victimless.

A reform such as this may move in one of two ways, or in both contemporaneously; from below upwards, and from above downwards. Many a safe and sound lesson has been taught the rich, whose first emanation may be traced back to the "brief and simple annals of the poor;" the good seed planted low and deep spreads, as it grows upwards, its goodly savour all around; the weeds and noxious plants grow too, but let us hope that their power of penetration in the upper strata is less strong. In the opposite direction, the influence is both more certain and more powerful. No action, good, bad, or indifferent, can be frequently or habitually performed by the upper classes of society without affecting the strata beneath, even to the very lowest point. What is called "fashion" shows this. The hoop, for example

—that wonderful piece of modern female attire—had scarce been six weeks in general use, ere every scullion and message-girl had their garments projecting in their lower verge, at every conceivable angle of deformity.

Even things apparently most peculiar to the upper ranks find their way downwards, and may be recognised at the very bottom ere long; if not in the exact shape they started with, yet in as close an imitation as possible. A gentleman who takes a lively interest in all social improvements, and often visits the dense, dark, dismal parts of the town, was one night groping his way up a steep and troublesome stair, to reach strange sounds of music and dancing that had caught his ear. Pushing open a crazy door, he found a small apartment crowded with poor Irish, male and female. The furniture consisted of a portion of a table propped up in one corner, bearing a tallow candle in a bottle, and an old earthenware jug. The music came from a cracked fife, energetically blown by a blind old man. The floor held the dancers in various groups; and ever and anon as the movements grew lively, a click was heard in the jug. "What *is* this?" he asked in amazement. "Oh, sure it's Phelim O'Grady that's bruk his hand, poor boy." "And is he here?" "Oh no, sure he's at home, in the fever; but we've got up a dance to help him." *It was an Irish charity ball in*

the Cowgate! The coppers were accumulating in the bit of earthenware, for the "bruk hand."

But while Nephalism is powerful to *prevent* drunkenness, and we fully recognise the truth of the proverb that "an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure"—we are thankful to know that the system is also well calculated to produce both these results. And if we would see drunkards *cured*, we must be Nephalists to help them. The matter may be stated briefly thus:—

1. *Every drunkard, in order to his recovery, must abstain absolutely from alcoholic drinks.* None deny this proposition, so far, at least, as the unconverted are concerned. Bring a drunkard to a knowledge of the truth, let him become a child of God; and the strength of grace in his heart, supporting the effort of his own renewed will, *may* enable him to remain sober, even while intromitting sparingly with the cause of his previous ruin. But, usually, there is no such trial made. The instant his eyes are opened, he not only abhors *himself*, and repents in dust and ashes, but abhors also *that thing* which made him what he was; and forthwith, voluntarily he resolves, God helping him, neither to touch, taste, nor handle it more. A gentleman lately in Ireland met a respectable, clean, tidy couple; and the following conversation occurred.—"Yes, yer honour, I'm clane now; but I'll tell you what I was,

yer honour." "Tuts, Pat," said the wife, "don't tell the gentleman what ye *was*, tell him what ye *are*." "But I will tell him what I was—glory to God; for it's He that's done it—I was a dirty drunken brute." "I tell you, Pat," again struck in the woman, "don't be troublin' the gentleman wid what ye *was*, tell him what ye *are*." "Indeed but it's true, yer honour; and many a time when I'd come home drunk, I'd bate the ould woman there, and the childer." "Wurra, wurra, Pat, sure ye don't do it now; it was the sorra drink that did it all, entirely"—again cried the wife—"don't trouble the gentleman wid what ye *was*, tell him what ye *are*." "Now it's but little we have," continued the man, "but we have it wid a blessing; and the wife and I thank God for it, on our knees—glory be to Him! And as for the dhrop o' drink, it *never crosses my throat*, and, *please God, never shall*." That is one of many examples of the Gospel in the heart, intuitively teaching abstinence in the life. Get men that length, and they are safe. But what of the unregenerate and drunken, whom we seek to save? Abstinence is to them essential, disjoined though it be, at first, from the reception of Gospel truth. Without a miracle, or something approaching to it, they cannot hope for recovery otherwise. I know of no exception to this in my own experience; and if there be exceptions in that of others, they can rank only as strengthenings of the general rule.

2. *If none but drunkards abstain, then no drunkard can abstain.* The reason is obvious. Abstinence under such circumstances would virtually be a public proclamation of personal intemperance. "Here am I, a drunkard; but now resolved to practise this self-denial essential to my recovery." To do this, in the face of the world, requires a great amount of moral courage. And what store of this has the man who is asked voluntarily to mount such a pillory? None—absolutely none, as yet. The alcohol has eaten it out, first and most, along with the rest of his moral nature. It may grow again by and by, through practice of abstinence. But now, when it is so urgently needed—life and all that is dear depending on it—there is none. Gladly and readily would he practise abstinence among sober and respectable men, they masking his penitential position; but alone, and as a *penitent*, he cannot. Some disputants, seeing the force of this proposition on the argument, demur to it. But their objection amounts to a mere denial. They have no proof of their assertion. And we are prepared to make our counter assertion good, by proof. Let me mention but one instance of how weak the moral courage is, even in the reformed drunkard, notwithstanding years of new growth. A tutor in a gentleman's family became intemperate, losing not only his situation, but also his license as a preacher. He re-

formed, and became clerk in a mercantile establishment. Long after, he dined in the house of his former patron, with a large party. One of his old pupils saw him arrive, and could not help overhearing some mysterious and earnest arrangement taking place between him and the butler. On enquiry, he learned that he had besought the servant—enforcing the entreaty with a bribe—to mix up ketchup and water so as to resemble port wine, and to place this in a decanter near him after dinner. During the repast, he thought to escape notice in his abstinence; but afterwards he feared detection. His solitary passing of the bottle, at that board, would have been a fresh avowal of his old sin, and he dared not face the trial. Had two or three of the party, well known for virtuous sobriety, been fellow abstinents that day, this poor brother's stomach would have been saved a fearful dose, and their's would have sustained no loss.

3. *If abstinence is essential to the recovery of the drunkard, and if companionship in abstinence by sober men be essential to the drunkard's practice of it, then that companionship must be made.* Having discussed that matter elsewhere,* I need not enter on it now. Indeed, no discussion is required; the proposition is self-evident. The only question is, who are to make

* Abstinence: its Place and Power. Nisbet & Co., London.

the companionship? And let the conscience of every man answer.

Who are to make the companionship? All those who believe in, and seek to keep, the second table of God's Law. That is one class, surely, who cannot, and who will not seek to escape the self-denial. Add to these all who, though not yet possessed of the "new heart and right spirit," yet are naturally generous, loving, kind, unselfish—so far. Add, again, all those who by birth or otherwise are related to the lapsed ones, and whose very instincts ought to force them into this needed sympathy with their own kith and kin. These three classes should constitute a goodly company!

How Christian men and women evade, or rather deny themselves, this duty and privilege, it is not easy to understand; unless, indeed, they err in mere ignorance—itself a sin. We are familiar, no doubt, with sundry excuses. We are told, for example, "the drunkard is not my brother." Well in one sense he may not be—not a brother in the Lord, or even in the church; but he is at least your "neighbour," and the commandment is, "Thou shalt love thy *neighbour* as thyself." But "Who is my neighbour?" do you reply? Then turn to the memorable answer to that same question from the mouth of our Lord Himself, in the parable of the good Samaritan. *The man in*

the ditch is your neighbour; fallen among thieves, stripped of his raiment, wounded and left half dead. And if you would obey God's law, go down to him—priests and Levites passing him by, if they will—lay hands on him and lift him out, binding up his wounds, carrying him to a place of safety, and not grudging the cost, either present or to come.

And is he not your *brother* too? Turn to another parable—that of the prodigal. Are you content to be as the froward "elder son in the field," refusing to own the outcast otherwise than thus—"This *thy son*, which hath devoured thy living with harlots?" Then hear the father reply, "This *thy brother* was dead and is alive again; it was meet that we should make merry and be glad."

Do you still object—"That was in the case of the prodigal, penitent and returning; leaving his husks and swine-trough, and seeking his father's home. Yonder drunkard is not in this attitude towards me." No; nor is he likely to be, perhaps, if the change is to depend on your personal exertions and example. But how know you that this very man is not one of God's very elect—ordained to life, purchased by the blood of the Son of God, your elder brother and his? If so—and how can you tell that he is not—he *is* your brother. John Bunyan was a drunkard. John Newton was a drunkard. Not only in the Church of

Corinth, but in every church of the present day, souls are to be found of whom the Spirit may say—"*and such were some of you;* but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." And how do you know that God's providence is not now inviting you to the honour and privilege, through some pains and self-denial, of being a fellow-worker with Him, in bringing other souls—like these—out of their cruel bondage?

If you *will* turn from this poor drunkard, the plea of "Not my brother" will not serve you. There is nothing for it but boldly to adopt the desperate resort of another elder son—Eve's first born—"Am I my brother's keeper?" Dare you abide the answer?

Men of the world show us an example—or rather, read us a rebuke in this respect. Some forty or fifty years ago, a regiment of the line had an addition of three or four young men made to its list of officers. Having no private fortune, these Ensigns soon discovered that they could not live at the common mess, and drink wine, without getting into debt; and that they must give up either the wine or the army. Fond of their profession, they resolved to abandon the former; and having taken this resolution, they frankly communicated it to their brother officers. These, instead of despising them, caballing against

them, and sending them "to Coventry," admired their manliness and courage; knowing well that young men who could face the sneer of friends, in the discharge of duty, would never blench from the front of a foe. And not only did they respect and commend—they resolved to support them. They agreed that on certain days of every week they *should all abstain from wine*, to keep the others company. And they were as good as their word. No matter the number or quality of the guests on these days, every man of those thirty officers sat at table with his glass turned down, drinking not one drop of wine; not because they did not like it—not a few, probably, liked it a little too well—but because they preferred a greater luxury—that of denying themselves on account of their younger and poorer brethren. Now if these British officers acted thus to save the pockets and feelings of their comrades, what should not we do in like manner, to save not merely the pockets and the feelings, but the character, the prospects, the lives, the souls of our fellow-men?

The very essence of Christianity is self-denial through love; and it is on this that our second plea in favour of Nephalism is founded. To estimate its true bearing, put it in the reverse way. Suppose yourself the drunkard. You are fully awake to your lost estate, and have resolved, God helping you, to

reform. You know that abstinence is essential to you; your own experience, as well as the opinion of those in whom you put confidence, has convinced you of that. But there is no one to bear you company, and you cannot be an abstinent alone. You fain would, you have tried again and again, but continually your courage fails you. You look to me, and such as I, and other men, we shall suppose, who may be leading temperate lives, and enjoying all things "moderately," according to the customs of the day—"Ah, help me to ascend yonder hill of abstinence!" you say, in look if not in words. "I dare not, cannot be there alone. Many a time have I tried, but ever without success; and now at the very thought of the attempt, my knees smite together, and my limbs fail me utterly. Am I to abandon myself to despair? Or will you, will you, bear me company? With your countenance and companionship, I feel I should be safe. I should have courage then; not only to go, but to stay. In the name of our common humanity, take pity on me and come! For the sake of my poor soul, for the sake of my wife and children, for the sake of Him who came to save such poor miserables as I, have compassion —come, and help me!" Methinks it needs a heart of stone to resist such an appeal. And are there not myriads of these continually around us!—the air is full of them—could we but hear their voices, and *feel*

them! Every drunkard, it seems to me, speaks thus to every man with the fear of God before his eyes, and with ordinary benevolence in his heart.

I have heard it said, "Oh, yes, I admit that *somebody* must keep the poor wretches company; all right! But don't ask *me* to be one of them." The heat of an argument may, in some degree, excuse this hasty speech; but as it cools, it must grow odious and offensive to the speaker himself—as the very essence of selfishness, the very antithesis of Christian love.

Are you afraid of the sneers of men? Then you have not counted the cost of following your Master. And one of his warnings perhaps you have forgotten—"Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he comes in the glory of His Father with the holy angels." Are you afraid of the self-denial; suspecting that it may prove both difficult and irksome to give up an old habit, to which both body and mind have been long accustomed? It is not so hard as you think; the struggle with appetite, if manfully, prayerfully met, will soon be over. And you will find your gain well worth the purchase—the comfort of your own condition enhanced; and a flood of satisfaction overspreading your whole soul, in reflecting on duty done, and effort made for the salvation of others. It will ever be found both a

pleasure and a profit to keep the golden rule, in all its breadth and bearing—"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

An honest shop-keeper in the north of Scotland, a worthy man and an elder of the church, was deeply imbued with all the peculiar prejudices against teetotalism, which are apt to beset men of respectable character; "a thing unreasonable and unscriptural: God, who gave us our reason, desires that we should make use of it in restraining and governing our appetites, not in starving and denying them: He who created the good things of this life, intended us to enjoy all of them, 'in moderation,' when placed within our power; in scripture, the moderate use of spirituous liquors is nowhere forbidden; sometimes you see, and oftener we hear, that men almost deify their temperance principles, and put outward reformation in place of vital godliness." All this, and much more, he was wont to think and say. And so the elder principled himself thoroughly against teetotalism.

One day, while engaged in measuring out his yards of cloth, a neighbour and customer whom he knew to have become all but a wreck through the use of intoxicating liquors, entered his shop. The poor man's face was flushed, and his eye excited and anxious; but this time he was perfectly sober. "Mr. Y—," said he,

"will you save a lost man? I want to take the pledge." "Well, do so; it's the best thing you can do." "But you know it would become a brand for the like of me, if men of respectable character, such as you, were not often found to take it too. Will you join the teetotalers, and *I'll join with you?* If not, I must go to ruin. It's my only chance. Mr. Y—, will you save a lost soul?" The elder was staggered and startled; some dim recollection of "Who is my neighbour?" and of the parable of the good Samaritan, awoke in his heart; and the fellow-creature before him, losing health, wealth, reputation, reason — stripped and wounded of the devil—did seem fully in as sore a plight as he who had fallen among thieves, long ago nigh unto Jericho. But then his own principles! they must be regarded. Mr Y— must be consistent, and the poor tailor must be left to take his own way.

Mr Y—'s dinner did him little good that day; his digestion failed greatly; appetite for supper he had none; and on retiring to rest, sleep came not near his pillow—scared ever by a voice that continually rung in his ears—"S— Y—, will you save a lost soul? S— Y—, will you save a lost soul?"

Early in the morning, two men were seen wending their way together to the office of the Teetotal Association. The one was the elder, principled in "moderation" and anti-teetotalism; the other was the drunken

tailor, on the verge of ruin, temporal and eternal. And *they took the pledge together.* S— Y— ate a good breakfast that day, and has slept soundly ever since.

"As far as I know," writes S— Y—, a twelvemonth after the signing, "the tailor has kept the pledge, and appears to be getting on nicely without the stimulus of spirits. He has had two attacks of asthma since becoming a teetotaler, and has got round without the usual appliance of whisky. He says it used to ease him in such cases for a short time; but afterwards he was the worse of it. Now he does without it."

S— Y— himself is the foremost of the teetotalers in the district.

Would that there were more S— Y—s! Then there would be more reclaimed tailors. Would that all would learn of the parable as faithfully, and become indeed good Samaritans in obeying the command, "Go, and do *thou* likewise."

It is not enough that you yourself escape "the corruption that is in the world through lust," if indeed you have wholly escaped it. "Beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance (ἐγκράτεια, absolute self-control in all things), ... and to godliness *brotherly kindness*, and to brotherly kindness *charity*" (love).

Are myriads of your neighbours and brethren

perishing, who through your example and help might have at least a chance of escape? And will you turn aside in cold neglect, if not in heartless apathy? Certainly that were not to love your neighbour as yourself—far less as Christ hath loved you.

Nephalism advocated on Peculiar and Professional Grounds.

—o—

I.—As to Ministers of the Gospel.

The two arguments we have endeavoured to expound seem to apply to this class with peculiar force, both for their own sakes (with particular reference to the first great commandment), and for the sake of others (in connection with the second).

Of all men they are specially called on to keep themselves, through God's grace, and the diligent use of all lawful means, "unspotted from the world"—that their personal religion may be "pure and undefiled." Their mental, moral, and spiritual nature must not, in any degree, be marred through sensual indulgence. They must be specially careful not to strengthen the "flesh" and weaken the "spirit," which are ever contrary, and lusting one against the other. And may they not find a special meaning for themselves in that collocation of texts to which we formerly alluded

(p. 50), wherein those who have been made kings and *priests* unto God are counselled to abstain from strong drinks; the *priests*, that they "may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean, and that they may *teach* all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken."

Turning to Paul's character of an ἐπίσκοπος, as given in his epistles to Timothy and Titus, is not this view enforced in considering the various qualities required? He is to be apt to teach, (διδάκτικον);* "patient" (ἐπιεικῆ); "no striker" (μὴ πλήκτην); "not a brawler" (ἄμαχον); "not soon angry" (μὴ ὀργίλον); also "sober" (σώφρονα); "not given to wine" (μὴ πάροινον); "temperate" (ἐγκρατῆ); "vigilant" (νηφάλιον). This last word, we know, (like νήφω) has two meanings, a literal and a metaphorical; the latter, "sober," in the wide sense of the term, including vigilance and other qualities dependent on sobriety; the former, "sober," absolutely, *i. e.*, implying absence of strong intoxicating drinks. Now, if the other terms which we have quoted carry the metaphorical meaning of νηφάλιος, in all its fulness, are we not at liberty—or rather constrained to infer that it is not this, but the literal meaning which the word is here designed to convey?

* "That he may teach all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken," (Lev. x. 11,) would not seem too free a translation here.

If it had been intended to allow intoxicants, and merely to guard against their use in "excess," would not the words "*μὴ πάροινον, σώφρονα,* and *ἐγκρατή,*" have been quite enough? If so, why add "*νηφάλιον*" in a merely metaphorical sense? We know there is no redundancy or unnecessary verbiage, in the inspired Word of God. The legitimate bearing of the passage seems to be this—the teaching of absolute sobriety, and self-control in all things (*ἐγκράτεια*); beginning with such injunctions as involve protection against the two foremost lusts of the flesh—"the husband of one wife, and *νηφάλιον*"—and then from that going on to specify those positive and negative virtues which occurred to him as being more peculiarily applicable to those whom he addressed.

Adopt the literal meaning then—counselling what we have ventured to call Nephalism—and does it not most appropriately fit in to all the rest? We know, through personal experience and observation, that the practice of that virtue will assist greatly in obtaining possession of the others. The man's mental nature, undimmed, unbiassed, unmaimed, will be better fitted to master (as finite understanding may), the great truths of the gospel—"all the statutes that the Lord hath spoken,"—and so he will become "apt to teach." His moral nature so far unseared, unscathed, he will be better able to "put difference between holy and unholy," as re-

gards both the teaching of others, and the training of himself. His spiritual nature so far unopposed—he will be better fitted for a pure, calm, close walk with God; at all times ready for spiritual work, whether in the closet or in the congregation; never taken unawares; never "not sober." His whole mind, too, will be more at ease; hopeful of safety for himself, as well as conscious of an honest, self-denying effort for the safety of others; and conscious, also, that his preaching against this special sin will be all the more likely to prove effectual through his personal influence and example. Men more readily follow "Come!" than they obey "Go!"*

And what should this example be? "Moderate" or "Abstinent?" The former to many within the minister's range may be as safe as to himself, though to none free from danger; but there are others, and not a few, in every district and congregation, to whom it is the very reverse of safety—absolute destruction. The drunkard, or the man who is steadily and progressively becoming so, cannot do in society as the "moderate" minister does; he cannot even taste the wine or other strong drink, without so reviving the slumbering embers of his internal fire, as to ensure its

* "Should all Skye perish through drink," lately said an aged servant of God, ministering there for many years in the gospel—"*these hands are clear of their doom.*"

demanding, with an authority which his moral nature has no power to resist, a further supply of its peculiar fuel with which to blaze up to the full.*

Is it not a solemn thought that the social example of a "moderate" minister can be no help to the drunkard, but the contrary? "Take care of yourself, John," says a sorrowing and anxious wife to her intemperate husband, as he leaves her to attend a merry-making in some friendly neighbour's—a marriage, or birth, or birth-day, when the customs of our country will insist on strong drink flowing somewhat freely round the table of hospitality. "Take care of yourself, and remember your weakness." "Oh, no fear of me. The minister is to be there. I'll do as he does; and then, you know, I must be all right." Alas, she knows no such thing—but quite the contrary. If he follow the minister's example, he is lost to all sobriety, for that night at least, perhaps for a score following, perhaps for ever!

Is it said, "I do what I conceive to be right, and pursue a course which he ought to have followed, and which I would have him yet attain to?" Very good. *But who is to help him in the meantime? Who, if not you?* What are your "marching orders?" as the Duke of Wellington used to say to clergymen perplexed on

* "Abstinence: its Place and Power," p. 31.

matters of conscience. To be made all things to all men, that by all means you may save some; to the weak to be as weak, that you may gain the weak, "Lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees, and make *straight* paths for *your* feet, lest that *which is lame* be turned out of the way; but *let it rather be healed.*" (Heb. xii. 13.) Are we not to infer from this that the path you are to walk in ought to be safe not only for yourself, but for *all* to follow; and that your business is to heal the lame, as well as to lead the sound? What grave words are these that tell the upshot of unfaithfulness? "Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God unto the shepherds, Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? . . . The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost? Behold I am against the shepherds." Ezekiel xxxiv. 2, 4, 10.

"The good Shepherd goeth before His sheep, and they follow Him." And was His example in any respect such as to prove unsafe to the most abject of sinners, repentant and returning? This involves the

discussion of a most important matter, to which we shall come by and by. Meanwhile, we simply point to His own words—"Come unto me, *all ye who labour, and are heavy laden,* and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me . . . for *my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.*" If the example of our Saviour had been that of one who partook of alcoholic drinks, even in greatest "moderation," how could this world-wide, and world-blessed invitation of mercy bring comfort to a poor penitent drunkard—asked, in following that example, to bear a yoke, and carry a burden, which he knows must crush him to the ground? The cry of mercy is not to the unfallen; but to them who "labour and are heavy laden." He came "not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."

Is not the example of the *good* Shepherd, to be followed by each *faithful* shepherd? going before the sheep, that the sheep may follow him; in a path which is suitable even to the lame; dangerous to none, and safe for all.

And be it remembered that the minister's influence is by no means limited to his own flock; it extends far and near; telling most on those who come into personal contact with him, yet affecting many, more or less, whom he saw perhaps but once, or even never saw at all. An illustration of accidental influence, of a sinister kind, was lately told me under very affecting

circumstances. A man of the world, under heavy sickness of body, and much spiritual alarm, confided to me his fears. The hardening of his heart, he said, had been of old standing, dating from early boyhood; the beginning on this wise. He was staying at a country manse, and it was the communion season. The services of the Sabbath had solemnized him much, and all that night his mind was occupied with the things pertaining to salvation. But Monday's dinner came; "and," said he, "when I saw the quantity of toddy consumed by the assembled ministers and elders—the officiators of the preceding day—and the noisy mirth it produced, I thought religion was all a sham, and my heart that day got a twist, and a hardening, which never began to yield till now."

Were Nephalism to prevail, such deadening influences could not be. On the contrary, men seeing the pure, calm, yet happy and gladsome ministerial walk in every one, would be more ready to believe in religion as a reality—a living, fruit-bearing thing. The ambassador would, in all respects, be a "living epistle" of his Master, "known and read of all men."

The advocacy of "moderate" drinking by a clergyman is very apt to act practically as a cover and excuse for the drunkard. At a public meeting, in the west of Scotland, an endeavour was made to establish a temperance society by the people. Several had spoken

earnestly in favour of the movement. The parish minister was present; but remained silent till near the close. He was a good man; an advocate of "temperance," specially so called; and could not see any necessity for teetotalism. After all had spoken, he said a little in favour of temperance in general, denouncing drunkenness as a great sin, but adding that he saw no need of any pledge, or any association; that each one, for himself or herself, should be able to use the good gifts of God without abusing them. He had no sooner sat down, than a drunken weaver staggered to his feet in the body of the hall, exclaiming, "That's richt, sir—that's richt! *Ye're on oor side!*" The minister rose on the instant, pale and under deep emotion, saying in tones of great solemnity, "If I am on your side, sir, I am wrong." That was the turning-point with him on that question. His "temperance" theory was scattered to the winds before the demonstrative power of stern experience; and the practical result was, that the association was formed, and the minister's name headed the list of its members.

In America, the clergy are surely in advance of us, in this respect. There it is not looked upon as reputable for a minister, in any of the Evangelical bodies, to be other than a Nephalist. Were he to indulge in strong drink, even "moderately," he would be regarded with surprise, if not with suspicion—unless, indeed,

when under the pressure of sickness and medical advice—and most certainly his ministerial usefulness would be largely impaired. "Like shepherd, like sheep." The people have profited by their clergy's example. And the Americans, as a people, it is well known, are more sober than we. Nor has any hindrance happened to their religion. With these same shepherds, and in this same flock, the late revival began its mighty and mysterious course; causing the wilderness and the solitary place to be glad, and the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose. And does it go for nothing with Father Chiniquy, as in gratitude and joy he counts himself and thousands of his countrymen converts to Christianity, that for many years previously he had laboured zealously and successfully as an apostle of Temperance?

How Nephalism should thus act as an auxiliary to religion, we can readily conceive. The *intellectual* condition of the hearer being more lively, he is more likely to understand the gospel, than were his faculties obtunded and obscured by narcotic indulgence; while the sight of his teacher, denying himself for his sake, tends to soften the *heart*, and open up the door of the *affections* for the gospel's entrance and reception. It is the same principle as in medical missions; getting at the understanding through the heart.

"I preach the gospel," says one; "that is my com-

mission, and that is the only cure for all moral evil." True; but how is it to reach the heart of the drunkard? Has not God ordained certain means auxiliary to this end, which it were blindness, and worse, to neglect and despise? Take an illustration from the Foreign Mission field. Our devoted brethren in India do not content themselves with simply preaching to the heathen there; but they use means—patiently, painfully, yet most perseveringly—for uprooting prejudice, removing ignorance, and so making a straight and level path on which the gospel's chariot may run. Men of the stamp of Alexander Duff, fitted alike to preach to the most enlightened, and to discourse in fervid eloquence to the most learned in all philosophy, sit down with the ignorant prejudiced Hindoo, and teach him the elements of knowledge. A noble sight truly! and not without its reward, even now. The barrier of ignorance removed, the stream of gospel light and liberty gives token of breaking in with a flood; God blessing the means, which He has led and taught His servants to employ. What they do in distant lands, shall we not do in our own? A double barrier besets us here—ignorance and intemperance. Special means are needful against both; and to neglect those special means for either, savours somewhat, surely, of ignorance in ourselves. To me it seems as unwise to neglect special means to remove

intemperance, as it were to neglect the well-known special means for educating the people—"And this we do for the gospel's sake."

This is peculiarly the age of "Home Missions." And the success already achieved in them calls loudly for increase of both prayers and pains. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." He must be a righteous man who prays; following after righteousness in his own walk and conversation, and wearing, through faith, that perfect robe which is Christ's. The prayer he utters must be fervent, believing, sustained, unwearied, importunate; and in order to be effectual, it must be working powerfully within him (δέησις ἐνεργουμένη); not only energetic in its aspiration, but practically working itself out in corresponding action. God ordains means to be used; and these He blesses. "Thy prayers and *thine alms* are come up as a memorial before God," was the intimation to Cornelius that his petition was heard and answered. A farmer prays for fruitful harvests; but if he rest content with that, and neglect to till the land, to sow the good seed, and to tend its growing, he must pass for a fanatic. And are not we tempted to like error? often content with prayer for God's Spirit on the masses, without taking any personal trouble thereto; asking for a spiritual harvest, and doing not a hand's turn at the spiritual husbandry? There

must be ploughing, the breaking of the clod, the sowing of the good seed, and the tending of it—above all the *draining* of the land, if we would look for the fruitful field. And such needful work seems to me necessarily to include Nephalism; the plying diligently that special mean for the removal of a special evil, in a way which, if duly sustained with fervent believing prayer, is calculated to serve the end in view, and to obtain the blessing of Him who alone giveth the increase.

But there is another consideration still. Ministers of the Gospel are not themselves safe from the gross sin of intemperance. Facts come in terrible array to demonstrate this. Seldom if ever a year passes, but in all the churches, in which discipline is available, some fallen brother is summoned to the bar of an ecclesiastical court, charged with this enormity; the prosecutors craving that "he be punished according to the rules and discipline of the Church, for the glory of God and edification of the Church, and to the terror of others holding the like sacred office."

One obvious source of this sore evil is the drinking customs and prejudices of the country. In all the joys, and anxieties, and griefs of life, as we have already stated, there must be strong drink; and on all these occasions the minister, of all men, is most expected to be present. To refuse the hospitality of the

social or domestic board on such occasions, is supposed to savour of churlishness and hardness of nature; and by some strange infatuation there seems to be an almost general consent that the due fulfilling of the mandate, "Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep" cannot be realised without partaking of that which makes joy a figment—artificial, delusive—and turns many a weeping into endless, hopeless, bitterness of soul. So the habit of "moderate" drinking is induced and maintained. And this is the social root of clerical intemperance.

The labours of a faithful minister, too, are great; both bodily and mental; and the sense of fatigue is for the time met, most pleasantly, by the alcoholic stimulus. He thinks so; his friends say so. He takes it. And this is the private or domestic root of the evil. Combined, the two form a strong stem, which shooting upwards, and expanding outwards, may require anxious and constant pruning to keep within the pollard bounds of "moderation."

Surely it were well to avoid such risk and such temptation, more especially as the indulgence in these things is proved, by both science and experience, to be quite unnecessary to the man in health, as well as in most conditions of disease; and if unnecessary, then injurious, more or less, to his corporal, intellectual, moral, and spiritual estate.

Nephalism, in this view, seems particularly incumbent on the young men, either already in, or purposing to enter into the ministerial office. "I do not hesitate," writes Principal Cunningham, "to state to our students my conviction, that if they were just *de facto* to abandon henceforth the use of all intoxicating liquors, the aggregate result upon the whole would be a prodigious benefit to them, to the community, and to the church of Christ." And I have never seen a clergyman who, while, on the score of years and old habit, declining to nephalize himself, has not admitted that for the "younger men," the practice was highly expedient. Taking leave of such, having gained no more than this good natured reply to my arguments, I have always felt two things.—1. They are right as to the young men. 2. They are wrong as to themselves; for their terms of declinature admit a certain amount of enslavement, which may, ere long, become complete and fatal.

What was Paul's conduct in reference to this matter? Ever in *training* that he might so run as to win the crown, and that he might fight a good fight—not as one that beateth the air—"*I keep under my body (ὑπωπιάζω), and bring it into subjection,* lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." "'Υπωπιάζω" is a strong word. He "beats his body black and blue," thoroughly to tame it; not

literally, of course; not weakening the health and strength of either his corporal or mental frame; but making sure that he subdues the "flesh" as opposed to the spirit. And is it consistent with this principle and practice, for any man in health—it may be, robust and full-blooded—to indulge in that luxury, even in "moderation," which tends not only to pamper the flesh, but to deaden the spirit—and so doubly to damage the athlete for the fight, for the wrestle, for the race?

Is there any means, consistent with scripture and common sense, which may, through God's blessing, avert the scandal and sin, of ministers under discipline for intemperance fully developed, and of others under grave suspicion and distrust for a like evil less plainly manifest? Is there any such trouble among the Nephalist ministers of America? And if they be free from that sin, with (I say not by) their Nephalism, why may not we? Is there any example of clerical Nephalism having done harm; either there or here? Is not the voice of experience plain and loud, not only as to no evil done by it, but as to much benefit received? Oh that the church would rise as one man, and resolve upon the great experiment!*

* In the Free Church, good progress is being made:—

Ordained ministers and missionaries,	263
Licentiates, . . .	56
Students of Divinity, . .	80

All the more as there is "that which is lame" among them; brethren who have fallen and been sore hurt, but through God's grace have risen again, at least for a time, and are now restored to their flocks, once more to divide the bread of life. These men *must* abstain utterly from all intoxicants; and are they to be left to solitariness and singularity in so doing? Is it not the duty of the people among whom they labour, to support them by their countenance and companionship? Does not a like duty attach to the presbytery, and to the synod, of which they are members? And is it an undue stretching of the principles and privilege of brotherly love, or only its legitimate and incumbent application, to extend the like duty to the whole church? There can be no quibble about "brother" now. The Pauline precept and example must here come in full force on the conscience of every one who allows the question to enter his mind without prejudice and partiality—"It is *good* neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is

In the United Presbyterian Church, too, the numbers read well—

Ministers, . . .	230
Licentiates, . . .	40
Students of Divinity, . .	100

But we desiderate yet greater things than these.

offended, or is made weak." (Rom. xiv. 21). "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." (1 Cor. viii. 13.)

And if the carrying out of this involve hardship, self-denial, patience, will not the gain far countervail the price—in being instrumental, under the good hand of God, in saving those weak brethren from again falling away, as well as in delivering others—more numerous it may be—whose feet are now in slippery places? This were a glorious example of true "charity" and its reward. "Above all things have fervent charity among yourselves; for charity shall cover the multitude of sins."* (1 Pet. iv. 8.)

2. As to Medical Men.

Much that has been said, as to personal danger and professional influence, applies equally to medical men. Personally, they sustain a graver risk than ministers. They are not restrained by any special sanctity in their

* At present, the interest of the church—as a church—seems specially connected with clerical Nephalism; all her troubles through litigation, and collision with law courts, springing from clerical intemperance. Satan, now, in search of Judases to betray their Master and His cause, primes them hard with that which he well knows will sear their conscience as with a hot iron, and fit them well in all respects for his vile ends.

profession; they are at least as much exposed to the almost unbroken temptation of local hospitalities; and they are more liable to be overtaken by the exhaustion of fatigue. In the country, especially, this holds true; and a long ride, over rough roads, or no roads at all, often ends in a weary watching all night long, with little available sustenance or refreshment, save what may be represented by meal, milk, and whisky. At first, such exposure may be borne with impunity; but by and by it tells. The hand, the eye, and the man, all grow unsteady together; and habits of inebriety may be not only contracted but confirmed, ere ever the victim is aware. The sad fact is, that among country medical practitioners, the proportion of intemperates is miserably large, more especially in connexion with advanced years; and no long time ever passes in the metropolis without a cry from some distant place for a sober medical man—not in lieu of one removed by death, but of one, or more, disqualified through intemperance. For such a profession, Nephalism is surely highly expedient; all the more when we remember that they, like the clergy, are at all times subject to sudden calls for the most delicate professional aid, requiring all their corporal and mental faculties undisturbed and unimpaired. "*Semper paratus*" should be the motto of all.

The Nephalist medical practitioner will both resist

and recover from fatigue more thoroughly, other things being equal, than the man who iudulges in alcoholics; at every hour, night and day, he will be perfectly ready for his professional duties, whether trifling or important; he will escape the snare of physical, mental, moral, and professional ruin, into which so many of his non-nephalist brethren so sadly fall; and his influence in maintaining habits of sobriety all around him will be second only to that of the minister of the Gospel. I have often thought, that if the clerical and medical professions were to combine as one united phalanx on this question, the victory would not be long doubtful. Who so well entitled to sway opinion, as those whose special profession it is to care for the souls and bodies of men? To whom will deference so readily and surely be paid, in a matter which affects both soul and body with such tremendous power?

3.—As to Educationists.

The personal advantages are still very obvious. Clear, calm intellect, and perfect self-control; temper equable; "aptness to teach;" mind and body both elastic under the fatigue of labour. Then as to influence. A late eminent educationist, when asked what quality he considered most valuable in a teacher of youth, answered, after considerable reflection—"his

eye;" explaining that, according to his experience, the eloquence of the human eye was as powerful in the guidance of youth, as in the training of the lower animals; the whole personal nature of the teacher thus going forth, as it were, into the taught. Of what importance is it, then, that this living and life-giving nature should be of such a kind as to be in all respects safe to the recipients!

4.—As to Students.

Here, too, there is special necessity for the "*mens sana in corpore sano.*" Our higher academies and our colleges are *training* schools—*gymnasia*—and are becoming more and more truly recognised as such. Both body and mind must be trained to health and "condition;" fit for due mental labour, duly sustained. This is the season, moreover, when "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life" most urge and try the man; and when all his means and appliances are most needed to subdue and restrain these enemies of the spirit. The hot blood will not be cooled by fiery stimulants; conscience will not be quickened, self-control will not be enhanced, by indulgence in that which tends more or less to deaden the one and defeat the other. How many a gallant youth makes total shipwreck of himself and fortunes through falling into quicksands and tides, from which, had it

not been for the heady and seductive stimulus, his quick and clear perception, cool reason, and commanding conscience might have saved him!

It is now, too, that the habits of life are forming. Industrious, frugal, temperate now? So, other things being equal, and God's grace enabling him, he is likely to remain. Idle, reckless, alcoholic now? Such is he likely to be, other things being equal, and unless God's grace arrest him, to the end of his days; year after year aggravating the evil. In a large proportion of inebriates, the habit was begun in early age; in the great majority of inebriates of the educated class, the habit is traced to the college time. Then is the turning point of the career, for weal or for woe.

Let it be remembered, too, that there are many constitutions specially predisposed to the sinister influence. Some drink hard for a time, rally, and recover quite. Others drink but little, *at first;* yet, once begun, have seemingly no power to stop, and ere long, casting off all restraint, pass headlong on to destruction. How often do we hear the young man entering on his college life, honestly and ingenuously tossing his head in answer to a parent's warnings, and bravely shouting "No fear of me; I'll take care; no fear of me!" How does he know that he is not one of those weak susceptibles, prone to fall before the coming temptation? You see a shepherd on the hill,

some bleak day, cowering behind a stone to light his match, strike hard and often at the flint; at every stroke the sparks fly profusely; still there is no smoke, or other sign of burning. The predisposed piece of tinder has not yet been singled out; at length, however, it is reached, and smoulders and fumes away. Even so it is with our poor humanity. Red sparks fall fast over some gay young company—night after night, and none is stricken yet. One day, however, there are whisperings, and hints, and rumours; broadening out soon into proof all too plain and palpable, that one or more have caught the fire at last, and are bursting into flame. Who is to put them out? "Aye, there's the rub!"

The tinder would have been safe, had the box's lid been on. The steel and flint might have showered their sparks, fiery and fast as ever fell from blacksmith's anvil, and yet the dried patch within might have bidden them defiance. Young men, *Keep on the lid!*

Hear the warning voice of a victim, the lost "Elia." "The waters have gone over me. But out of the depths, could I be heard, I would cry out to all those who have but set a foot in the perilous flood. Could the youth to whom the flavour of the first wine is delicious as the opening scenes of life, or the entering upon some newly discovered paradise, look into my

desolation, and be made to understand what a dreary thing it is when a man shall feel himself going down a precipice with open eyes and passive will—to see his destruction and have no power to stop it, and yet feel it all the way emanating from himself; to see all godliness emptied out of him, and yet not able to forget a time when it was otherwise; to bear about the piteous spectacle of his own ruin; could he see my fevered eye, feverish with last night's drinking, and feverishly looking for to-night's repetition of the folly; could he but feel the body of death out of which I cry hourly, and with feebler outcry, to be delivered, it were enough to make him dash the sparkling beverage to the earth in all the pride of its mantling temptation."

Hear yet another—snared by the cognate drug. Coleridge, speaking of what good he had done as a literary man, proceeds—"But oh, dear friend, this consciousness, raised by insult of enemies, and alienated friends, stands me in little stead to my own soul; in how little, then, before the all-righteous Judge, who, requiring back the talents He had entrusted, will, if the mercies of Christ do not intervene, not demand of me what I have done, *but why I did not do more;* why with powers above so many, I had sunk in many things below most." . . . "The temptation which I have constantly to fight up against,

is a fear that if *annihilation*, and the *possibility of heaven*, were offered to my choice, I should choose the former." . . . "For ten years the anguish of my spirit has been indescribable, the sense of my danger staring, but the consciousness of my GUILT worse—far worse than all. I have prayed with drops of agony; trembling, not only before the justice of my Maker, but even before the mercy of my Redeemer. I was seduced into the *accursed* habit ignorantly."

One might go on to speak of profession after profession, and relation of life after relation, benefiting peculiarly by Nephalism. *Of soldiers*, for example. What a snare drink is to them! The source of all their punishment and privations; marring their discipline, brutalising their natures, injuring their health and strength, robbing them of coolness, and self-resource, and even endangering their courage. "Turn out the saints! Havelock never blunders, and his men are never drunk."

Of *Sailors*—still more victimized by "grog;" and who, if freed from this, their greatest enemy, might safely vaunt themselves incomparable.

Of *Masters*, reaping the reward of true temperance in themselves; exhibiting a good example to their subordinates; and finding, in the good conduct and

prosperity of these, ample compensation for any slight or scorn from unthinking onlookers.

Of *Servants*, profiting in better working capital (health and strength), and more of it; in better character and better wages; in domestic comfort and prosperous outward estate.

But I forbear; and conclude this part of the statement by a *resumé* of the argument—urging the claims of Nephalism,

1. *On your own account.*

Better for your bodily state,
Better for your mental state,
Better for your moral state,
Better for your spiritual state.

And so, favourable to your keeping of the first great commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with *all* thy heart, and with *all* thy soul, and with *all* thy strength, and with *all* thy mind."

2. *On account of others.*

Breaking up the drinking customs, and so preventing drunkards.

Giving respectability to Nephalism, and so helping in their cure.

And thus so far fulfilling the second great commandment—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Both must be kept. The second springs infallibly from the first; and the one is the proof of the other. "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments." (1 John v. 2). "If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that *loveth not his brother* whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" (1 John iv. 20).

PART II.

—o—

Objections Met.

—o—

Of these I wish to select the most common, as well as the most formidable; seeking to blink no part of this question; and desiring not victory but the truth.

No counterstatement to our arguments is more frequently made than this, "*Moderation is right; excess only is evil.*" The latest and boldest exponent of this view is the distinguished author of a recent pamphlet, called "A Plea for Temperance." Let us deal with this, frankly and fairly.

The motto of the book is the well-known Scripture quotation, "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit." As was formerly noticed (p. 53), the word "excess" here is a very insufficient translation of the original "ἀσωτία"—this implying the condition of extremest moral degradation. The Apostle exhorts converts to "walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the

days are evil. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is. And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess (*μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία*); but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord," &c. (Ephes. v. 15, &c.) One of two meanings seems apparent here—1. A warning against wine which intoxicates, *in which* (*ἐν ᾧ*) there is *ἀσωτία*; and the context agrees well with this; intimating the necessity of keeping the mind clear to understand the will of the Lord, the danger of trusting to such artificial means of gladdening the heart, and the duty of seeking true enjoyment and happiness, through being "filled with the Spirit." This view, however, it may be said, is strained, and makes out too favourable a case for Nephalism. But without admitting that allegation, we proceed to the other alternative. 2. There is here—if you insist on attaching the "*ἐν ᾧ*" to the "*μεθύσκεσθε*," and not to the "*οἴνῳ*"—though the latter arrangement seems fully as natural—a denunciation against drunkenness as being at the lowest pitch of moral defilement. And what ground have we for supposing that the writer intended us to deduce from that a permission, or injunction, to partake of intoxicating drink to an extent short of actual "drunkenness," or saturation with strong drink

—all the more when we remember how inclusive the sin of inebriety is in the sight of God. (p. 65.) The denouncement of a maximum use of intoxicants as the basest of all sin, cannot surely imply the sanction of a smaller use of the same intoxicants as a safe and commendable thing! And, besides, how will the idea of such a meaning being intended here tally with the context, enjoining the calm, cool understanding, and the trusting to spiritual enjoyments—"speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." If there be a single atom of truth in our physiological view of the effects of unnecessary alcoholics, used far within the range of what is ordinarily termed "excess," there is an absolute incompatibility.

Is it argued that drunkenness only being here condemned, while nothing is said as to all indulgence that may be short of this, there is at least no direct and peremptory condemnation of "moderate drinking?" And is it further maintained, that the apostle, writing to converts in a heathen city, where drunkenness was known to abound, would scarcely have been silent as to the dangers of "moderate drinking," had he believed such to exist? We reply, that for us, at least, there is no such reticence. Comparing Scripture with Scripture, there will be found, as has already been shown, in the writings of both Paul and Peter, not

only large general principles from which the practice of Nephalism is to be inferred, but also special injunctions for its observance.

"Drink intoxicants sparingly, if you will; avoid only intoxication!" has but feeble support from the text adduced in its favour. And, insufficient in its scriptural foundation, the maxim is equally unsound in its scientific principle. Theory and observation alike go to prove that the unnecessary use of narcotics, in every form and degree, is always dangerous, more or less; as tending not only to overbalance mental control, but to subdue and enslave the whole *physique*, whereby a pleasant luxury may advance into the position of an inevitable habit, and ultimately establish itself as a ruling passion which cannot be denied. The risk of this is more or less in every one; in some the progress is all but irresistible. And the true and only way to ensure absolute safety to all, is the restricting the use of these things to those special circumstances in which both science and experience tell us they are safe.

Unsound in its scriptural and scientific principles, this mandate or "indulgence" to drink strong drink "in moderation," is inconsistent with its known effects on the social condition. As formerly stated (p. 63) it is not the man absolutely drunk, according to the ordinary meaning of the term, who is most dangerous to himself or others; but the man who has drunk more

"moderately"—not enough to bring him under the care of police, as "drunk and incapable"—but enough to expose him to the clutch of the legal arm as a criminal. It is to "the drink" and "the drinking," that our magistrates and sheriffs and judges attribute the crime, and poverty, and misery that so much abound.

And again we must repeat that the practice of moderate drinking is not found to prevent excessive drinking. On the contrary, the former generates and maintains an unnatural desire for stimulants, which grows, and fixes itself all but immovably; always tending, sooner or later, to break out into obvious excess, either acute and paroxysmal, or chronic and continuous. It is not from abstinents as a class, whether enforced or voluntary, that the intemperates come.

Take a ship. Does the ordinary, daily, "moderate" allowance of grog tend to preserve the sailor from violent excess on his touching the shore? On the contrary, the appetite for strong drink, instead of being satiated by former allowances, has been but whetted and kept on fine edge, so as to prove all the more trenchant and irresistible when opportunity of satiation comes in his way. While, on the other hand, entire abstinence during the six, twelve, or eighteen months of a long cruise—even in those involuntarily

subjected to it—will, we believe, result in a deadening, dulling, and weakening of the appetite, rendering it both less urgent in its demand, and more tolerant of denial. We only wish this experiment were more frequently tried than it is. Let the result on this point be what it might, one great benefit could not fail to accrue—viz., greater safety, meanwhile, to ships and men.

From one class of the community, and only one, our author withdraws his indulgence—it is the drunkard. He must abstain utterly. Right. But then two or three questions rise to the tip of one's tongue here, all abreast. 1. What makes the drunkards? Drinking none, or drinking a little? 2. If the drunkard is to abstain alone, how can he? (p 84,) 3. How many actual drunkards will confess themselves to be so, and follow the advice given to that class? Not one out of every hundred. The remaining ninety-nine think themselves "not so bad as that yet;" and jumping gladly at the authoritative manifesto in favour of "moderation versus excess," continue the course which is fast sweeping them to destruction. This is no mere theory. Experience proves it to be too true.

An objector of the same class asserts—"*Every creature of God is good; and, if not required, I am at*

least permitted, to enjoy it with thanksgiving:" quoting in his support the well-known passage, 1 Tim. iv. 4. One might meet him on his own superficial and erroneous view of the quotation, by saying, Yes; every creature of God is good, but not for eating and drinking. Ocean's brine and the coral reef are "good creatures of God," but not to be so dealt with; henbane, belladonna, hellebore, are the like, but not to be quaffed in goblets; and opium, alcohol, arsenic, come under a like category. Or one might deny that alcohol, *tortured by man* out of cereals and the vine, is in any true sense a "creature of God." But, waiving all that, the conclusive answer is, that obviously the Apostle had here no allusion to *drinks* at all in his mind. He was speaking of *meats,* and of meats only; in reference to the "seducing spirits that forbid to marry and command to abstain from *meats*" (βρωμάτων), which God hath created (ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν) . . . for every creature of God is good, &c. (ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα.) The "creature" here obviously corresponds to the "creation" of *meats;* and therefore the disputant who founds on this in regard to *drinks,* is founding on a fallacy.

"*But,*" says another, "*God intends that man should exercise reason and self-control, and look and lean upon His protecting grace. Abstinence implies a doubt of His promise, and a shirking of our duty.*" The author of

the "Plea for Temperance" adopts some such view; and in his appendix appeals to Dean Alford for support—quoting this sentence among others, "He pours out His bounty for *all*, and He vouchsafes His grace to *each* for guidance; and to endeavour to evade the work which He has appointed for each man, *by refusing the bounty to save the trouble of seeking the grace*, is an attempt which must ever end in degradation of the individual motives, and in social demoralisation, &c." Some misgiving seems to have fallen on the head of the quoter, as he transferred these lines to his side of the argument: for he adds "The *Italics* are the Dean's." And well may he guard himself against absolute identification with the learned and Reverend Dean in this matter. For, 1. It is an entire misstatement of the case to say that Nephalism implies the slightest approach to the sentiment of refusing a bounty (?) to save the trouble of seeking the grace. We refuse what he calls the bounty, not to save the trouble of seeking the grace, but in order all the more earnestly and sincerely to seek the grace. We even seek grace, to *enable* us to refuse the so-called "bounty;" and we seek grace, too, to enable us to continue such refusal steadfastly unto the end.*

* "Do you ever taste drink now," said some one to an old woman who had been reclaimed from intemperance. "Drink! whenever I even think of drink, *I fall on my knees and pray.*"

2. Without being learned in divinity, or presuming to cope with either of the reverend gentlemen there, I do not forget the simple elementary truths of religion; and these, happily, are enough in this case. There is an old prayer, with which all Christian men, in this country, have from their youth been familiar—directly emanating from Divine wisdom, which has a petition thus—"Lead us not into temptation." And the Lord himself, in practically expounding this, has said, "Watch and pray, that ye *enter not* into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." The Dean's way of it seems to my dull wits, not only to enter into "temptation," but into that very special temptation which, as we have seen, opposes the will of the spirit, and gives to the flesh a terrible power—also rendering true "watching" of at least difficult attainment. This is but a poor commentary on the Lord's prayer, and reminds one of another portion of holy writ: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid." "Certainly," the Dean seems to say, "it is right at least to continue in *temptation to* sin, that grace may be more and more abundant." We have heard of an Irishman complaining that he was "blue-moulded for want of a batin." And if a man has any Irish blood in him, this circumstance may in part, perhaps, account for such peculiar views in this

matter. For ourselves, we have enough to do with the temptations that beset us on every side, without seeking new ones; and while we pray, "*Lead* us not into temptation," we shall ever seek grace to restrain our feet from *entering* upon the path of the tempter, as well as to strengthen our hands and heart in contending with those trials which come unsought and unbidden. To resume our former illustration, the Dean and his reverend friend may be very Blondins on the *plank;* we are content to pass humbly on the *bridge.**

"*The use (not the abuse) of drinks capable of producing intoxication is permitted by God. He himself has endowed the body with the capacity of being stimulated pleasurably by wine and strong drink. If you ask me for what end? I reply that, as far as I can see, it is for adding to man's enjoyment and his health, &c.*" Will the author, from whose "Plea for Temperance"

* The following passage of scripture seems to have strong and direct bearing upon this question: "Then the devil taketh Him up into the holy city, and setteth Him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto Him, If thou be the Son of God, *cast thyself down;* for it is written, *He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.* Jesus said unto him, It *is written* again, *Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.*" Matt. iv. 5-7.

we have taken this very remarkable statement, be good enough to suppose a Chinaman using his very words in reference to opium? Has he not a cause? Has not God endowed his body with the capacity of being stimulated pleasurably by opium? (identical in its scientific classification with "wine and strong drink.") For what end? As far as he can see, for adding to his enjoyment and his health. According to our author's principle, the native of the flowery land is guilty of no offence, scarce even of imprudence, in whiffing his opium-cloud "in moderation!"

In one point we wholly agree: it is "the *use*, and not the abuse of drinks capable of producing intoxication that is permitted by God." But the right use, according to our system, is the medicinal use of that which is medicinal; all other ordinary or luxurious use of such things is abuse, in the light of reason and of revelation both—or to employ our author's own words, "it is the wrong way of using God's blessings, and bringing them out of the holy and beautiful kingdom of Christ, into the vile and horrible kingdom of darkness."

God gives the grape and its unfermented juice as food, to make glad the heart of man; the corn, too, to make the young men cheerful. Man, by one of his "many inventions," extracts a narcotic substance from these, as from the poppy, the henbane, the aconite—

all "good gifts" in their proper sphere and way. But use them as food or luxuries, then this is abuse; and again to adopt the words of our author. "The devil gives us nothing, for he is no creator, but a robber only of God's gifts to soul and body. It is his work to pervert them and abuse them for his own vile purposes and ends; to 'break through and steal' the beautiful gold coin out of God's treasury, and with which God would enrich us; and to bring it into his own kingdom of darkness, there stamp it with his own foul image, and then circulate it among men as the only coin that can purchase happiness." Corn and the grape are "good creatures of God." Alcohol extracted from them, and used luxuriously, if not the creature, is at least the agent of another power, permitted to try the children of men.

"*Let your moderation be known to all men,*" cries one. That is his principle; and he supposes that it bears him out in moderate drinking. Not knowing, probably, that what is translated "moderation" (τὸ ἐπιεικές) has nothing whatever to do with this or any other sensual indulgence, but only with restraint of temper, and emotion in general. "Let your gentleness, patience, equanimity, be known unto all men." And even were it otherwise, let the quoter read on—"Let your moderation be known unto all men. *The*

Lord is at hand." Let him further compare this with the parallel passage (1 Pet. iv. 7)—"But the end of all things is at hand; be ye therefore sober (σωφρονήσατε), and watch (νήψατε) unto prayer." Take his way of it, in view of these things, and what does his principle amount to but that of the fool—"Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die?"

But, to come to more reasonable objections, though not more common, many say, "*I mean to keep my liberty.*" What is liberty in this case? Take man's view of it first. Am I constrained to continue the use of this luxury, especially when in society, in deference to public opinion? Is that liberty, or is it subjection to the will of another? Do I continue the use of this thing—quite "in moderation" it is supposed—whether in society or not, because I like it, and cannot abandon it without a good deal of trouble and inconvenience, which I have not made up my mind to undergo? Is that liberty, or is it enslavement to appetite and custom? May such a one prate of his liberty? reminding us of the quaint language of Carlyle—"No man oppresseth thee, O free and independent franchiser! but does not this stupid pewter-pot oppress thee? No son of Adam can bid thee come or go; but this absurd pot of heavy wet—this can, and does! Thou art the thrall, not of Cedric the Saxon, but of thy own brutal appe-

tites, and this scoured dish of liquor. And thou pratest of thy liberty? Thou entire blockhead!"

Or am I free from subjection to the opinions, customs, prejudices of the world around me, free also from all compulsion or even solicitation of appetite, free to *obey my own will*, and that of no mortal man besides—bound only by the suggestion and command of conscience? Is not that true liberty? I make up my mind to follow a certain course of conduct, for my own sake and that of my fellow-men; I am free to act that out, so long as I remain of that opinion. So soon as my conviction alters—if it alters—I am free to change my conduct accordingly. Is not that true liberty? And such is Nephalism.

And what is the Bible's view of liberty? That "the perfect law of liberty" is the law of God. (James i. 25.) That the enjoyment of liberty is the observing of that law; "he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant." (1 Cor. vii. 22.) That the path of duty and safety, as well as of happiness, is in the observance of this law—"So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." (James ii. 12.) The freest man that ever trod this earth was He, who is himself the source of all true freedom, and who said—"I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." . . . "I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent

me." . . . "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." "Even Christ pleased not Himself." He is our great exemplar; and a like mind must be in us if we would faithfully follow Him. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation . . . humbled himself." "If any will come after me let him deny himself (deny himself *utterly*, it is in the original), and take up his cross daily and follow me."

Our greatest tyrants are Satan and Self; and if we would be free from one of these, we must be free from both.

> "He is the freeman whom the Truth makes free,
> And all are slaves beside."

There is a fancied liberty against which we do well to take heed: imagining that we are free to do in all things precisely as we list, provided we avoid the commission of overt sin in the acts themselves. Against this we are warned by Paul, both on our own account and on that of others—"Take heed lest by any means this *liberty of yours* become a stumbling-block to those that are weak" (1 Cor. viii. 9). "Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty *for an occasion to the flesh*, but by love

serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." (Galatians v. 13, 14.)*

Is it argued—"I have enough to do with myself; and if others pervert my example that is their affair, not mine?" What make you of this express command —"Thou shalt in anywise rebuke thy neighbour, *and not suffer sin upon him.* . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, *I am the Lord.*" (Lev. xix. 17, 18.) And again—"If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; if thou sayest, Behold we knew it not; doth not He that pondereth the heart consider it? and He that keepeth thy soul doth not He know it? and shall not He render to every man according to his works?" (Prov. xxiv. 11, 12.)

Remember the extent and degree of love required —"Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself.*" Doing that, we shall do well; for whatever opinion we may entertain of our own merits on many points, few

* A worthy man is reported to have said—"I consider myself bound to take a glass of wine or spirits now and then, in society, to protest against drunkenness on the one hand, and teetotalism on the other." Is he prepared, I wonder, to endorse the sentiment of poor Burns, whose "liberty" in this way was but short-lived—

"Freedom and whisky gang thegither—
Tak' aff your dram!"

can help liking and loving themselves very much, so far as the securing of personal interest is concerned. And let us love our brethren, then, in like measure. But still that is not all—"As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you," says the Lord himself, adding, "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, *as I have loved you.*" (John xv. 9, 12.) Let every one seek to carry out *that,* so far as he may; God's Holy Spirit teaching and guiding him. He will then find the true liberty—"Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

"Is the Jew to have more liberty than the Christian in meats and drinks?" No! Without admitting that the Jew has, or had, a dispensation to indulge in intoxicating drinks, we beg to remind you that this was a subject with which Paul was specially well acquainted; first, as a Pharisee of the Pharisees, and then as the apostle of the Gentiles; and both his example and teaching therefore come to be specially important. Was there ever a more uncompromising champion of Christian liberty than he? and on this very point too? the man who "withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision." (Galat. ii. 11, 12.) What does Paul say? "All things

are *lawful* unto me, but all things are *not expedient;* all things are lawful for me, but *I will not be brought under the power of any.*" (1 Cor. vi. 12.) "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but all things *edify not.* Let no man seek his own, but every man another's; (1 Cor. x. 24). . . . even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved." (1 Cor. x. 33.)

The liberty of the Christian is the power to deny himself for the sake of others, even as his Master did for his sake. Would Paul have found himself at liberty to identify himself with the drinking customs of the present day, which are so obviously and avowedly a main cause of the prevailing drunkenness? Brethren in the ministry falling around him through this sin, would he have protested for his "liberty" by continuing, notwithstanding, to drink strong drink "in moderation?" Had he lived in these days, is it extravagant to suppose that he would himself have been a Nephalist on the very same ground as we occupy? 1. For his own sake—"I will not be brought under the power of any." 2. For others—"Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more . . . To the weak became I as weak that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men, that I might by all

means save some." 3. For others and himself both—"And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you. Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things (p. 59). Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. *I* therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body (ὑπωπιάζω) and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." (1 Cor. ix. 19, &c.) Reflecting on these and many kindred passages, some of which we have already quoted, I find it hard to resist the conviction that not only would Paul have been a Nephalist now, but that he was a Nephalist then, actually abstaining from the use of intoxicating drink, unless, perhaps, when under the pressure of sickness, like Timothy his beloved son in the faith.

"*Temperance is a higher morality than abstinence—I prefer and practise the former.*" I once so thought and acted, too; but have long since changed my mind. In the cold, theoretical abstract, the statement looks well enough. It seems a higher range of self-control to be able to handle everything without hurt, than to

abstain from any one thing, lest it hurt you. The latter seems to imply fear, cowardice, distrust of one's self, and perhaps distrust of the promise, "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." And yet Paul we find—whose courage was only equalled by his faith—was not only ready to abstain, but actually did abstain from things which were "lawful" for him, because they were not "expedient," and because they "edified not."

Or, put the matter in this way. There are two men. The one is an immaculate (apparently), and intromits with these intoxicants, from time to time, with great "moderation." He practises "temperance." The other has been in the slough, and its slime and stench may be still on him. He knows that the slightest tasting of his enemy will prove fatal to reform, and is eschewing it utterly; practising "abstinence." Does the former arrogate to himself the higher place in morality? Perhaps he does; and perhaps he may. But if he stick to it, may there not be a dash of the Pharisee in such an attitude? "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican!" The latter, assuredly, will not dispute his claim. But how stands the matter in regard to *approval* in the sight of God? Does not He look with more interest and satisfaction on fallen men recovered

and restored, than on purest angels that never fell. And is there not "joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, *more than* over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance?"

Put it in a third way. Take other two men. The one, temperate, is walking in his own path, looking well-satisfied with himself, and not wondering that men regard him as a fit model for imitation—a point to look up to, fully as much as a line to move alongside of; he hears of penitent drunkards abstaining, and approves highly of their conduct, hopeful even that, *some day*, they may be able to aspire to his standard of excellence, and do as he does, exercising their "liberty," and walking on the very pinnacle of the moral range. Look at him, and put him aside. Then take the other. He *might* do precisely as the first, if he chose, having the same high principle and equal self-control. But he *does not so choose.* He chooses rather to take a humbler path; not to enact a "*pas seul*" on the top of the hill, but to walk in humbler company on a lower level; not to look upon his own things, but also upon the things of others; not to please himself but to please his neighbour; not to occupy the place which is merely safe and suitable to him, but that which alone is safe and suitable to hundreds and thousands of perishing fellow-creatures around—to him "not grievous," and to them "safe."

He is ready to sink somewhat, or even a great deal, in the esteem of superficial thinkers, and short-sighted as well as selfish observers, if he, by so doing, knows that personally he loses not a whit of good standing-ground in the sight of his God, and, at the same time, helps to raise up those that have grievously fallen away. He asserts his liberty, to deny himself for his friends' and brethren's sakes — aye, and for the sake of his Master. And he practises Nephalism accordingly, not on compulsion, but of his own free will. Put these two men together now, and see which bulks the larger on the moral scale? A Nephalist on compulsion, remembering his former self, may quail and crouch beneath the gaze of a "temperate" or "moderate drinker" from his youth up. But a Nephalist of free choice, on principle, and principle the highest — supreme love to God, with a love to his neighbour as to himself — will not, cannot, dare not yield to any man, in asserting not only the depth but also the breadth and height of that truth on which he knows his actings to be framed.

The highest morality is that which, springing from supreme love to God, with a love equalised between ourselves and our fellow-man, so shapes our conduct as to favour purity of life in ourselves, and the advancement of the greatest good in others. That

which is most like Christ; who, tempted in all respects as we, yet without sin, ever denied Himself, and went about continually doing good.

This brings us to the most grave of all objections, and one which we desire to approach with that holy reverence the subject must ever demand—"*I follow the example of Christ.*"

A great deal of misconception has arisen on this point, from considering the matter on a wrong platform; arguing as if the social customs and conditions of men in the time of our Lord, in Judea, were identical with, or closely similar to, those of our own country in the present day. Let us premise, then, one or two things.

Then, men had the option of drinking one of two kinds of wine; unfermented and unintoxicating; fermented and intoxicating. Both kinds were in use; some of the latter strong enough,—witness the cases of Noah, Lot, Uriah, &c.—but seldom used in social intercourse except after very ample dilution in water; the former in more general use, in ordinary circumstances, and among the common run of men. There was the recent juice of the grape, its pure "blood," drunk during the grape season; pure, or diluted with water or milk, as in vine countries in the present day.

There was the same juice boiled down to a syrup that it might keep; and subsequently diluted, when required for use. Besides, there was the pure grape juice, without inspissation; and preserved to any length of time by one of two processes—either by "the sulphur cure," or by boiling. And both of these means for preserving unfermented wine are in use still. In reference to the latter, Liebig says, "If a flask be filled with grape juice, and be made air-tight, and then kept for a few hours in boiling water, or until the contained grape juice has become throughout heated to the boiling point, the minute amount of oxygen contained in the air, which entered the flask with the grape juice, becomes absorbed during the operation, by the constituents of the juice, and thus the cause of further perturbation is removed. The wine does not now ferment, but remains perfectly sweet until the flask is again opened, and its contents brought into contact with the air." In whichever way prepared or "cured," the unfermented wine was preserved in *new* bottles, or skins; it being quite plain that old bottles, or skins, admitting air, as well as containing a residuum of vegetable matter, would have not only permitted but forced on fermentation, resulting in loss. "No man putteth new wine into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish. But new wine must be put into

new bottles; and both are preserved." (Luke v. 37, 38.)*

Grapes, too, can be kept in the cluster all the year round, from which at any time recently-made wine may be at once produced.

Some people have great difficulty in understanding how anything can be really called "wine" which is unfermented; such is the strength of prejudice and custom. They see only the fermented wine now, and they cannot fancy the possibility of any other, either now or formerly. "How will it keep?" they say. Not long ago I made the acquaintance of an

* What follows this passage of Scripture is, by some, supposed to be contrary to our principles—"No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith, The old is better." Luke v. 39. At first sight, and judging according to the customs of the present time, it looks as if this were a taking for granted that the best wine is that which, thoroughly fermented, and of "full body," has mellowed by time—of course intoxicating. But compare the text with the context, and the meaning comes out plainly thus. The ceremonials of the old dispensation are not to be engrossed with the new, because this were both unsuitable and unsafe. Old garments will not bear the insertion of new cloth; old bottles will not bear new wine; and "no man, having drunk old wine, *immediately* desires new, for he saith, The old is more *wholesome* (χρηστότερος)." Old cloth and new will not agree in the garment; a rent occurs, and bad is made worse. Old bottles and new wine will not agree; the former are burst, and the wine is spilled. Old wine and new wine will not agree in the living organism when taken together at a meal; pain and disturbance follow.

extensive wine-grower on the Moselle. "Have you any unfermented wine—juice of the grape?" said I. "Tons," said he. "How old?" "Some of it fully ten years." And then he went on to explain two modes of preserving it, in its pure, natural, unfermented state; one by the boiling process, another by the "sulphur cure," both precisely as practised in olden times. The latter method he preferred: filling the cask nearly full, then burning sulphur in the empty portion, and whilst the fumes were still there fastening all tightly by the bung. So it was kept unfermented, for mixing subsequently with the fermenting grape-juice, to constitute the sparkling wines peculiar to that district.

There need be no difficulty, then, in understanding how not only the recent *juice of the grape*, ere any fermentation shall have had time to begin, may be harmlessly drunk in the grape season, by young or old of the domestic or social circle—pure, or diluted either with water or milk; or, how unfermented, harmless *wine* may be used with equal safety, pure or diluted, at any time of the year, whether in the grape season or not.

"In Holland, at the present day, it is the custom of the Spanish wine-merchants, immediately after the vintage, to present to each of their customers a few bottles of the unfermented juice of the grape. It is

there commonly called new wine, and sometimes *must.* . . The Dutch consider it as a great treat, and it is customary to hear the host say to a female, "Do not be afraid, it will not hurt you; it is new wine."*

"When on the south coast of Italy," says Captain Treatt, "last Christmas (1845), I inquired particularly about the wines in common use, and found that *those esteemed the best were sweet and unintoxicating.* The boiled juice of the grape is in common use in Sicily. About three gallons of the juice is boiled until reduced to two; it is then poured into plates to cool. The poor people mix flour with theirs while boiling, to make it go farther. It is eaten at their meals with bread, and very nice it is. The Calabrians keep their intoxicating and unintoxicating wines in separate apartments. The bottles are generally marked. From inquiries, I found that *the unfermented wine was esteemed the most. It was drunk mixed with water.* Great pains were taken in the vintage season to have a good stock of it laid by."†

* Extracted from "Scripture Testimony against Intoxicating Wine," by Rev. Wm. Ritchie, Dunse;—a pamphlet containing a great deal of very valuable information on this subject.

† "The present wines of Jerusalem and Lebanon," says Jacobus, Professor of Biblical Literature in Alleghany, "as we tasted them, were

"In our own land," says Dr Duff, in his account of his journey through France, "wine has *become* so exclusively a mere luxury, or, what is worse, by a species of manufacture, an intoxicating beverage, that many have wondered how the Bible speaks of wine in conjunction with corn, and other staple supports of animal life. Now, in passing through the region of vineyards in the east of France, one must at once perceive that the vine greatly flourishes on slopes and heights where the soil is too poor and gravelly to maintain either corn for food or pasturage for cattle. But what is the Providential design in rendering this soil, favoured by a genial atmosphere, so productive of the vine, if its fruit become solely either an article of luxury, or an instrument of vice? The answer is, that Providence had no such design. Look at the peasant at his meals, in wine-bearing districts. Instead of milk, he has a basin of pure, unadulterated 'blood of the grape.' In this its native, original state, it is a plain, simple, and wholesome liquid, which, at every repast becomes to the husbandman what milk is to the shepherd, not a luxury, but a necessary—not an intoxicating, but a nutritive beverage. Hence, to the

commonly boiled and sweet, without intoxicating qualities such as *we* have got in liquors called wines. The boiling prevents the fermentation. Those were esteemed the best wines which were least strong."

vine-dressing peasant of Auxerre, for example, an abundant vintage, as connected with his own sustenance, is as important as an overflowing dairy to the pastoral peasant of Ayrshire; and hence, by such a view of the subject, are the language and sense of Scripture vindicated from the very appearance of favouring what is merely luxurious, or positively noxious, when it so constantly magnifies a well-replenished wine-press, in a rocky, mountainous country, like that of Palestine, as one of the richest bounties of a generous Providence."*

Let it be further remembered, that many different words are all translated "wine" in the Bible. The words most commonly employed are—*tirosh*, in Hebrew, which means the entire produce of the vine in the solid form; *yain*, in the same language, which means the juice of the grape, whether fermented or unfermented; οἶνος, in Greek, of like meaning with *yain*. So that the word "wine," in our English Bible, may mean, so far as the word alone is concerned, intoxicating or unintoxicating wine—much as "man," as a general term, may mean a good man or a bad man, a man regenerate or unregenerate; or as "water" may mean salt or fresh, "strong" or pure, rain-water or well-water, &c.; the true meaning, in an individual

* Missionary Record, April, 1840.

case, being determined by the context, and other circumstances.

Furthermore, the ordinary beverages which we call "wine," and use as such in the present day, had no existence in Judea then—except the lighter and pure clarets, and unadulterated wines of that sort. These, no doubt, had their analogues in those days. But the port, sherry, madeira, burgundies, strong clarets, champagnes, in present use, are all "doctored"—analogous to the "mixed wine" of old, which was drugged, and which is invariably denounced in Holy Writ as most pernicious. Among the early Greeks and Romans, their ordinary wines for festive use were mixed, under the eye of the Symposiarch, in well-regulated establishments, not with drugs of any kind, but with water—copiously.* Ours, on the other hand, are not only drunk at table without dilution, but mixed in quite a different way. A large distillery here sends its whisky, in two tolerably equal halves, to France and to Spain ; in the one case to return as

* "The wine was almost invariably mixed with water, and to drink it unmingled was considered a characteristic of barbarism. . . . So universal was it not to drink wine unless mixed with water, that the word οἶνος is always applied to such a mixture, and whenever wine is spoken of in connection with drinking, we are always to understand wine mixed with water, unless the word ἄκρατος is expressly added. .

brandy, in the other as port or sherry. And the wine-merchants are honest enough to tell us, that not a drop of these wines is sold in this country without being brandied, or, to speak more accurately, *whiskied.* The liquor would not suit the public taste and convenience otherwise. In short, the plain truth is, that the wines ordinarily drunk in the present day by "moderate" drinkers, as well as by the immoderate, belong to the class of "mixed wines,"* the use of which Scripture invariably stigmatizes as evil actually, or the emblem of evil. "Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? They that go to seek *mixed* wine (*mesech*)." (Prov. xxiii. 30.) "In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of *mixture (mesech);*

. . . The proportion in which the wine and water were mixed was fixed by him (the Symposiarch), and also how much each of the company was to drink."—Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities.

* "The ancients, as we have seen, seldom ventured to indulge in pure wine, and even condemned the free use of it when tempered with only an equal measure of water. What, then, would they have said, had they witnessed the taste of modern times, and of this nation in particular, which, not content with the most potent vintages that can be extracted from the grape, seeks to give them a fictitious strength, by the further addition of alcohol? That wines thus compounded are rendered doubly injurious to the constitution, is very certain."—Henderson, History of Ancient and Modern Wines.

and he poureth out of the same: but the dregs thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them." (Ps. lxxv. 8.) "Ye are they that forsake the Lord, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish the *drink-offering* (the same word, *mesech*, "mixed wine,") unto that number. Therefore will I remember you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter." (Isa. lxv. 11, 12.) "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to *mingle* strong drink." (Isa. v. 22.)

Wisdom's mingling of her wine is very different. "Wisdom (The Divine Wisdom) hath . . . mingled her wine, she hath also furnished her table . . . whoso is simple let him turn in hither; as for him that wanteth understanding, she saith to him, Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled. Forsake the foolish and live." (Prov. ix. 2-5.) "I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse; I have gathered my myrrh with my spice; I have eaten my honey-comb with my honey; I have drunk my wine with my milk; Eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved!" (Cant. v. 1.) "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money, and without price." (Isa. lv. 1.)

As to whisky, brandy, rum, gin—the prime agents of intemperance in our masses—and constituting, moreover, when diluted and sweetened, the staple of nine-tenths of the "moderate" drinking among our clergy, and others of the middle class—these things had no existence whatever then: and, in all probability, anything actually corresponding to our strong ales and porters was alike unknown. The Hebrew word, *shechar*, used in the Old Testament —sometimes translated "wine," but more frequently "strong drink"—is no true analogue of "the strong drink" of the present day. It means the fluid obtained from dates, palms, and such like; the liquid product of the orchard, as *yain* is the liquid product of the vineyard. According to Kitto, it means one of three things;—1. Sweet, saccharine syrup from dates or palms, unfermented; used either as a sweatmeat, or as a drink when diluted with water; of course unintoxicating. 2. Wine from the date or palm, sweet, fresh, unfermented, unintoxicating. 3. The wine of the palm, fermented, bitter, intoxicating, It *may* have any of these three meanings; the context will tell which. It is used twenty-three times in the Old Testament. In twenty-one of these it is spoken of in terms of warning or disapproval; in the remaining two, its employment is alluded to in connection with religious ordinances. As to the former, therefore, are

we not to infer that the fermented, intoxicating variety is meant; while in the latter examples, the allusion is to the unfermented—such things being alone allowable according to the ritual of the Jewish religion? And here, accordingly, we may at once, in passing, dispose of one class of objectors—not a small one, and inclusive even of some theologians—who quote the passage in Deut. xiv. 26, as a proof that God permits the joyous, free, social use of "strong drink."

Understanding, then, that the intoxicants now in ordinary use in this country, as a means of personal and social entertainment, had no existence in Judea, 1800 years ago; that the wines then and there used were of two kinds, fermented and unfermented, intoxicating and non-intoxicating; that the latter were in at least as frequent use as the former, and that even in the present day, in wine-growing countries, these unfermented wines are equally esteemed as the fermented, and by some "esteemed the best;" that drunkenness was by no means a specially prevailing crime in Judea, certainly not the most prominent of the sins of the Jews; and concluding, therefore, that the people had then the *option* of drinking either the intoxicating or the non-intoxicating wines, with the bias of custom and propriety doubtless leaning towards the latter—let us now reverently approach the personal example of our Saviour; premising only this much

more, viz., that if I found it proved that He, either Himself drank intoxicating wine, or made it and caused it to be drunk by others, my mouth would be for ever shut as an advocate for Nephalism.

Did He ever Himself drink intoxicating (fermented) wine? The only ground for alleging the affirmative is, that He came in contrast to John the Baptist. John was a Nazarite; He was not. "John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and ye say he hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber, (or wine-drinker, οἰνοπότης) a friend of publicans and sinners." (Luke vii. 33, 34.) There is no admission here, of course, of any use of wine immoderate or injurious, or in any way improper, any more than, in the eating of bread, there was anything supposed to be in the slightest degree bordering upon gluttony. All that is meant is, that while John came as a Nazarite, drinking no wine, the Nazarene came, not as a Nazarite, but partaking occasionally of wine, of course in a manner and degree absolutely devoid of all sin. Now, if it had been necessary to prove His freedom from the Nazarite vow, through infringement of its terms, by His partaking of fermented, and consequently intoxicating wine, my case falls to the ground. But how stand the facts? The Nazarite's vow we find thus described: "He shall separate him-

self from wine *(yain)*, and strong drink *(shechar)*, and shall drink no *vinegar of wine*, or *vinegar of strong drink*, neither shall he drink *any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes, or dried.* All the days of his separation shall he eat *nothing that is made of the vine tree, from the kernels even to the husk.*" (Numb. vi. 3, 4.) In order to assert His liberty from that vow, then, it was enough that He should partake of "moist grapes or dried," or of "*any liquor of grapes*," or of "*anything that is made of the vine tree, from the kernels even to the husk.*" The wine used might be fermented or unfermented; if the product of the grape at all, that was enough. And with that option, is it reasonable —is it possible—to believe that He preferred at any time that which contained the element of intoxication? Is such an act credible on the part of Him of whom it was prophesied, "Butter and honey shall he eat, *that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good.*" (Isaiah vii. 15.)

"Did He ever partake of fermented wine, mingled, or pure, as a medicinal agent, in the crisis of sickness, or exhaustion, or pain?" We cannot tell. But this much we know, that in the inspired narrative of his terrible decease accomplished at Jerusalem, these solemn words occur: "They gave Him to drink wine mingled with myrrh; *but he received it not.*"

Not only is there no proof that He ever partook of

intoxicating wine, but, on the contrary, the inference, if not the proof, is diametrically opposed to any such idea. *Did he ever make intoxicating wine, to be consumed by others in social enjoyment?* This brings us to the far-famed scene at Cana of Galilee. "The mother of Jesus was there: and both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage," among Jews of the humbler sort, no doubt, for He had no relationship with the rich or great till in the tomb. As the feast went on—not continuous in its eatings and drinkings, but interrupted, according to the various meals, as might happen at Christmas-week parties, in country houses, in our own day—the stock of wine which they had provided, and thought sufficient, is exhausted. Mary applies to her son for more. Six water-pots of stone, set there "after the manner of the purifying of the Jews," and capable of "containing two or three firkins apiece," are, by His command, filled with water. "*And they filled them up to the brim.*" He then "saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare." The ruler of the feast, having tasted the water made wine, saith, "Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have *well drunk* (μεθυσθῶσι), then that which is worse (ἐλάσσω, less, or inferior to—poor); but thou hast kept the good (καλόν) wine until now. This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and

manifested forth his glory, and his disciples believed on him." (John ii. 1-11.)

Two questions now emerge. Was the wine, provided for the feast, and consumed prematurely, intoxicating or non-intoxicating? It must have been one or other. Which? Let us consider both alternatives.

1. Suppose it to have been unfermented and non-intoxicating—the natural supposition; all the more as "the Jews' passover being then at hand," the time was within a month or two of the close of the grape season, when, of course, this kind of wine could, with perfect facility, be obtained. The party have been enjoying themselves with the innocent beverage, and at its conclusion a further supply is required. The Son of God, who came to save men from their sins, knowing the infirmities of men, Himself tempted of Satan, but Himself "tempting no man," makes 80, or 90, or 120 gallons of wine, and commands it to be served to the guests. The men and women have been partaking of *innocent food* and refreshment, and they ask for more. Will *He* give them, in answer, that which is not food, and not innocent—that which His own Word declares to be a "mocker" and "raging?" "If a son shall ask *bread* of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a *fish*, will he for a fish give him a *serpent?* or if he shall ask an *egg*, will he give him a *scorpion?*" (Luke xi. 11, 12.) "If

ye then, being evil, know how to give *good gifts* unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven, give *good things* to them that ask him?" (Matt. vii. 11.) To men and women who have been enjoying "good things" analogous to bread, fish, an egg, will the Lord himself, the God of holiness, truth, and love, give that of which He warns all men to beware, not even to "look upon" it, because, "at the last, *it biteth like a serpent*, and *stingeth like an adder?*" (Prov. xxiii. 32.) *He did this, if he made intoxicating wine then.* And to imagine such an act possible, is surely blasphemy, as if placing the Lord of glory on a lower level of morality than "any of you that is a father, being evil!"

2. *Suppose the first supply of wine to have been fermented, and consequently intoxicating, more or less*—the only other alternative. The obvious inference then, is, from the remarks of the governor of the feast, that in that case the guests had not only consumed all that had been provided, and in the first instance considered sufficient, but had taken "as much as was good for them," to use an expressive phrase of the present day. "Μεθυσθῶσι" is the word; according to one of its meanings, "are saturated with what they have been drinking;" according to the other, "they are drunk." And if what they have been drinking is intoxicant, then the sinister meaning is necessarily implied — drunk, or,

at the very least, upon the verge of inebriety. To men or women under such circumstances, are we to suppose that Christ gave 80, or 90, or 120 gallons of wine, as intoxicating, nay, more intoxicating, for then "καλόν" must mean "strong," as "ἐλάσσω" must mean not only "inferior," or "small," but "*weak?*" Can we suppose that He who has declared in His inexorable law, one jot or tittle of which cannot pass away, that *no drunkard* (μέθυσοι; mark the practical identity of this word with μεθυσθῶσι ("well-drunk") as descriptive of the guests) *shall inherit the kingdom of God;*" that He, to a party of marriage-guests, either already drunk, or on the very brink of becoming so, should not only give 80, or 90, or 120 gallons of wine, as intoxicating as that which they had already used to excess, but more intoxicating still—practically tempting them to complete the act which shall put them in danger of hell, if they repent not? Is that conceivable? Is such an alternative not grosser blasphemy than the other? practically supposing the Lord of Glory, "who tempteth no man," to be like unto Satan and his agents, whose work He came to destroy; nay, worse, practically subjecting Christ to his own terrible anathema against such a tempter: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that puttest thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also, . . . the cup of the Lord's right hand shall be turned unto

thee, and *shameful spewing shall be on thy glory.*" (Hab. ii. 15, 16.) The supposed alternative is impossible—absolutely impossible. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and *manifested forth His glory.*" And, in consequence of that glorious manifestation, "*His disciples believed on Him.*"

One consideration more:—According to the governor of the feast (v. 10), it was customary, in drinking parties, to produce inferior wine "*after men had well drunk;*" obviously because by that time their alcoholic indulgence had so blunted their perception, and perverted their taste, as to render them incapable of distinguishing good from bad. But that the present entertainment was of a different kind, is shown by the marked superiority of the new wine having been instantly recognised—"Thou hast kept the good wine until now;" a circumstance which, of itself, may not unreasonably be held as going far to determine the fact, that it was not an intoxicating beverage of which the guests had previously partaken.

On the whole, the inference seems inevitable, that the guests had been enjoying themselves with unintoxicating wine, and that their deficient stock was supplied by the Giver of all Good, by wine of a like nature, but of richer and rarer quality. Had it been otherwise, had they been drunk, or in any degree approaching thereto, the request for more wine would not have

been complied with, but refused with indignant rebuke. He would have done then, as doubtless He would do now, if we can suppose Him personally introduced to a marriage-feast of the present day, loaded with fiery intoxicants, what we are told, a few verses on, He did in the temple—He would have made a scourge of small cords, and driven them all out, saying, "*Take these things hence!*"

Is it still argued, "*I follow my Master's example. He took wine, and so do I.*" We reply, *You cannot follow His example in this thing, absolutely.* He had the option of intoxicating and non-intoxicating wine, both then and there in ordinary use. *You have no such option.* The only wine in ordinary use now, and here, is intoxicant, and intensely so.

Do you conceive that you are bound literally to imitate His example in all things? Then carry it out in food, occupation, clothing, dwelling, possessions. Probably the master sin of the Jews, then as now, was covetousness—"the love of money, the root of all evil;" and from the things pertaining to that, our Lord was indeed an abstinent. In need of money to pay a tax, Peter had to ask it from the tenants of the deep. "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head."

The true following of our Lord's example in such things, is not in the letter, but in the spirit; not according to any rigid Pharisaism, but in the light and liberty of the gospel. His constant occupation was in fulfilling the whole law; loving the Father with his whole heart, and soul, and strength, and mind, and his neighbours as Himself. And what the latter love was, we may have some faint idea when we look to Gethsemane and Calvary; where, taking their sins upon Himself, He bore all the wrath of the righteous expiation: "He *humbled* Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," *for their sake.* If we would follow his example, let the like mind be in us; asking ourselves, ever and anon, to what extent the sins of others have led to *our* self-denial and humiliation.

"*Religion is enough. Get the grace of God into man's heart, and he will not sin.*" Certainly. And, as we have already (p. 105) stated, Nephalism is a means to that end. Religion is enough, unquestionably, *when got.* But, how to get it? That is the question. Nephalism will not impart it; but it may pave the way for its being imparted. The man himself, through abstinence, having all his mental faculties entire, and his carnal lusts not unduly stimulated, is in a favourable position to receive the truth

intellectually; while, seeing a self-denying abstinence, for his sake, in him who brings that truth to him—whether minister or layman—his heart will be softened and subdued thereby; and the whole man, consequently, will be placed in a fitting attitude, not only to receive, but to retain the truth. Drunkenness, on the other hand, and even drinking to an extent far short of what men call drunkenness, both hardens the heart and dulls the mind; retaining the unhappy creature in that bondage which is so specially opposed to the freedom that is in Christ Jesus. The Egyptian thrall, long ago, was bad enough in this respect. When Moses spake unto the Children of Israel, offering them liberation from their oppressors, admission into the good land promised to their fathers, and the immediate protection of the outstretched arm of the Lord their God, "they hearkened not unto Moses, *for anguish of spirit and for cruel bondage*." (Exod. vi. 9.) And so it is in our day. The cruel bondage of strong drink, sterner far than that of Pharaoh, so dulls the ear, that men "hearken not" to the words of a greater than Moses. Lift away that load, even should it be but in part, and only for a time; diligently improve the opportunity so given; and may we not then look for a more willing ear to the glad tidings of the gospel? "Cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take the stumbling-block out of the way of my people!" (Isaiah lvii. 14.)

And even when religion is got, when the man's heart has been made new, is not Nephalism an additional safety? and is not its practice to be inferred as binding on him (that he may "Enter not into temptation") by the teaching of that law and testimony which he has now resolved shall be his only directory for life? How often do we see, in our own day, good men lapsing for a time, and even heinously, through sins of the flesh, of whom we cannot doubt that "the root of the matter is in them," and that God will ultimately restore them to their "first love;" but whom He has now permitted to fall because of their own unwariness, and in order to teach both them and others the importance of all wisdom and circumspection in their walk—watching (p. 57) and praying that they enter not into temptation. These men are saved in the end, but "as with fire." They do not lose their souls; but they part, for the time at least, with much of their peace, and of their souls' purity. They receive full pardon for this and all other sin, in the end; but, meanwhile, besides retarding their own spiritual progress, and marring God's work in their own heart, they have brought foul dishonour on their Master's name, and grieved his Holy Spirit; they have placed a stumbling-block in the way of other men, and may have done such damage to the cause of true religion, as all their subsequent strivings may utterly fail to repair.

The Church is an hospital, for the cure of the sick and the maimed. Once fairly within, once truly converted to God, the patient will not die of his disease; but he may not expect an absolute immunity from relapse, or threatened relapse, till he pass into that freer and purer atmosphere beyond, where there is no death and no sin. The Christian is convalescent here, not cured. His own heart, and the enemy without, are ever tempting him to such imprudences as may peril his recovery; and it is alike his duty and his wisdom to keep a strict watch upon himself, lest he err in regimen, and so sustain both loss and injury. Strong drink we know to be one of Satan's grandest agencies as an antidote to the gospel. With this he follows the truth into men's hearts, and would wile it out again, or drown it as it lies;* with this he follows the preaching of the Word, and hardens the hearts of the masses, so that they hear as if they heard not; with this he follows the Bible and the missionary into heathen lands, and, ever sowing his accursed tares after and among the good seed, would choke and strangle it; with this he follows the tide of Revivals in our own land

* I am informed, on good authority, that, of about 2000 souls supposed to have been converted, in Londonderry, during the late revival, two only have fallen away, and that through drink.

and day, and, casting it as oil upon the waters, which, as in the pool of Bethesda, the Spirit of God has troubled, would have them hushed and still again, as a dead sea. If men were wise, they would outwit him there; with both watching and prayer they would strive to enter not into temptation.

It were a lamentable error to imagine that Nephalism, or any such outward aid, can, of itself, keep men from sin. Abstinence will lift a man out of the slough of drunkenness, but it is not of itself sufficient to keep him in the place of elevation and safety. Another power than his must intervene—a help greater than man's. The rivet* (p. 82) must be in the heart ere all is made secure. But it is equally erroneous to suppose, that it is in harmony with God's will to content ourselves with the preaching of the Gospel only, to the neglect of all those auxiliary means to which He points in His providence, and has proved that He

* "The stranger looked earnestly at me, and exclaimed, putting his hand to his breast, 'Put me in a *rivet here*,' with emphasis; 'I want to be bound fast, for, if I *once* TASTE, I'm done for!' Before I had time to answer, Charles W—— exclaimed, 'You attend her meeting regular in the school-room; you will have a rivet put in fast enough then, I warrant you.' 'Yes, and by a higher power than mine,' was my answer. 'That's what I mean,' says Charles W——. 'He'll hear something there that will show him that he must look above for strength.'"—Haste to the Rescue, p. 121.

will bless. Such a conclusion would, indeed, involve an arrogance beyond any that we poor Nephalists have ever been suspected of: casting, as it were, a slur upon the practice of our Lord and his immediate followers, who not only preached the gospel, in season and out of season, but went about continually doing good, ministering to men's bodily wants aud infirmities, interested in all their affairs of life; and *this they did for the Gospel's sake.*

David Naismith, the humble yet illustrious founder of the London City Mission, testifies that he regarded it "as a duty to aid a work (the temperance movement) which is such a powerful auxiliary to the extension of the kingdom of Christ." The late Bishop of London said, "After the most mature deliberation, I am convinced that no scheme has ever been devised more auxiliary to the great ends of religion, than that of the formation of temperance societies." And another occupant of the Episcopal bench, Dr Stanley, of Norwich, spoke yet more pointedly and plainly in the House of Lords, "I have witnessed, not only individuals, but masses of persons, who before had been heedless, profligate, and irreligious, turning over a new leaf when they became members of temperance societies; and those who had never frequented places of worship before, constantly attending them after joining this society." Honestly adding, "My evidence

on this subject ought to have some weight, as I commenced" (like Mrs Wightman) "by opposing total abstinence societies, but ended in being convinced of their utility." "Several members of my church," says the Rev. Newman Hall, "were plunged in the worst kind of infidelity—the infidelity of habitual profligacy—until grappled with by total abstinence. Having then become sober, they are now also, through the grace of God, living a righteous and godly life."

"*Teetotalers place teetotalism in room of the gospel.*" No true teetotaler does. If we hear of any such thing, we say, "An enemy hath done this." We profess the contrary. Our Nephalism we seek to honour as a stepping-stone to the gospel; as a humble but useful means, under God's blessing, of helping "to exalt the valley and make low the mountain and hill; to make the crooked straight, and the rough places plain; to prepare the way of the Lord, making straight in the desert a highway for our God; that the glory of the Lord may be revealed, *and all flesh may see it together.*" That is the honour to which we aspire in this thing; and we praise God that we can look back thankfully, and know that *He has* blessed it to that end. Therein is our abundant reward; an overwhelming compensation for all the cold looks and suspicions and contempts of the world, and even of

friends, in the knowledge that we have been thus instrumental, in the hands of God, not only in saving men from sickness, death, and temporal ruin, but in their being turned from their sin with loathing, to forsake *all* their idols, and serve only the living and the true God.

Look at the husbandry of the field. The farmer sows his seed—good seed; but does not rest content with that. He prepares the ground to receive the seed; and he tends the seed in the prepared ground as it grows. He ploughs, harrows, gathers roots and wrack, and *drains;* then he sows; and as the blade springs up he watches for the choking weeds, and plucks them carefully. In all this, no one ever dreams of accusing him of any neglect or slight put upon the seed, or the sowing of it. He is not putting the plough, or the harrow, or the lime, or the manure, or the hoe, or the tile, in place of the seed. On the contrary, he is using all these as helps to the seed, both in its growing and in its springing up. He is the wise husbandman; seeking a good soil for the good seed, and then looking in confidence to Him who alone can give the increase. In the moral agriculture of the present day, when the ground is so wet and sour, and foul with natural produce of the rankest kind, there is need of all the aids and appliances of the most advanced husbandry. Most especially is

the drainage needed; and let no wise or prudent man seek to thwart or discourage those who have given themselves to this good work, by unjust suspicions of their motives, as on the one hand desirous of vain-glory and "to be seen of men," or, on the other, opposed to the sowing or the sowers of that good seed from which alone the spiritual harvest can come. On the contrary, give us credit for what we profess to be,—fellow-labourers in the common cause of advancing God's glory in the good of men; and, sinking all prejudices and dislikes, look fairly and faithfully into the whole matter, in the light of scripture, science, and common sense, and see then, if it be not your duty—all ye ploughers, harrowers, and sowers alike—to "come over and help us."

Do you still answer, and stave off, by saying "We tell you that we know Teetotalism is preached as another gospel?" We reply, the more need of you, and of all good men, to put down such evil. Is Nephalism sound in abstract principle? Is it consistent with, and deducible from, the teachings of scripture? Is it in harmony with the truths of science? Is it borne out by the voice of ample experience? Is it a thing thus good in itself? And is it true that evil men have in some quarters got hold of it, and given it a bias towards Satan's side? Then we say two things. 1. That is to lay nothing more to its charge than can be

laid to the charge of every other good thing. The very word of God has been by impious hands wrested unto men's destruction. 2. Then there is the more need for you, and such as you, to put to your hand, and pull and push the other way, with all your might and main. Satan opposes all schemes that oppose him and his kingdom. He overturns them, if he can; failing in that, he mounts the box and drives. Of Nephalism he has no good opinion; he hates it with a perfect hatred. He has sought to obstruct and upset it; but as the wheels still roll on, he falls back upon his ordinary tactics, and seeks to lead it away into his own siding. It is *he* that puts evil men into the direction of the movement, that they may do his work therein and thereby. And it is the business of all true and good men to put themselves in;—and when in, to work with a will—that they may counteract his workmen and his working; giving the right direction and bias to the whole movement, and inscribing on every portion of it "Holiness unto the Lord."

"*But my influence is so very limited. If I thought that I could be of any use, then—.*" This is a very common shift—for it scarce amounts to the dignity of an "objection," among those who are half convinced, and yet unwilling to begin. We answer, 1. Every man has his radius; it is ever shifting, and he can

never tell its exact range; far less can he tell what *may* be coming round upon its circle. Atoms of no great moment, and no great number, may be rolling there; or there may come a crowd, all unexpectedly, of the most momentous kind. It is his business to be ever ready for all comers. 2. If the radius be good in its influence, it is his duty to be ever seeking to extend that radius. 3. If it be short, and comparatively inextensible, it is required that he set himself in downright earnest to be all the more busy in making the most of what he has. Remember the parable of the talents. The delinquent there is not condemned for having so little capital to start with, but for having made no effort to trade with this for his master's interest. When the one talent was given him, he was expected—and he knew it was his duty—to labour on that, as diligently as he who had ten times its amount; nay, more so; the call to labour may have positively increased with the limitation of means at his disposal.

Let every man make the most of what he has received, whether as an original gift, or in the course of a bounteous Providence; and then responsibility as to the result need not make him afraid. Like the woman in Bethany who broke the alabaster box of ointment, and anointed the head of her Lord, he will have "done what he could;" and that will be recorded as a "memorial" of him. His lantern may

be small, but let him see to it all the more that it is bright and burnished; well-trimmed and tended—

> "Nor let the meanest think
> His lamp too dim;
> In a dark world,
> The Lord hath need of him."

"*Nephalism is not supported by scriptural example.*" Look again! Look to the children of Israel, led by God's own hand, forty years in the wilderness—"Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk wine nor strong drink; *that ye might know that I am the Lord your God.*" (Deut. xxix. 6.) And it was doubtless part of their heavy sin that, notwithstanding this favourable condition for their moral and spiritual being, they yet so waywardly and so oft rebelled against Him. Look to the case of Nadab and Abihu; Nephalism enjoined by God upon the entire priesthood for ever; and that for one offence committed by two people. Surely that is sufficient answer, by the way, to those who object to abstinence on their own part, "because a few (?) make beasts of themselves through excess." Look to Samuel; and contrast his pure life with the chequered career of his immediate followers. Look to the Rechabites; commended of God for their filial obedience *in their Nephalism.* Look to Daniel and his compatriots, whose "counte-

nances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat;" "and in all matters of wisdom and understanding that the king enquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm." Look to the Nazarites in a mass, but specially to John the Baptist—"he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God"—the preparer of the way—the Herald of the Gospel, proclaiming "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Look to Samson and his mother; the injunction coming twice, not only that he should be a Nazarite, but that she, too, should not drink wine nor strong drink; and the angel who bare the mandate being none other than the Lord himself. Look to the command of abstinence on kings and priests, formerly alluded to (p. 54). Look to the whole teaching of Paul, to the practice of Timothy, and to the warning of Peter—"Abstain from the fleshly lusts that war against the soul." Look to the whole life and teaching of Christ, as already explained. Look to the two great commandments, on which hang all the law and the prophets. And, in view of all this, let us ask our

intellect and our heart, if Nephalism be not a means to help to the keeping of them both—the loving of the Lord our God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, and mind—and the loving of our neighbour as ourselves—aye, "even as I have loved you."

"*But Nephalism was not prevalent in apostolic times; as you would have it to prevail now.*" Perhaps not; although we see no proof to the contrary, so far as the true followers of Jesus were concerned. There is no evidence of the apostles and their brethren in the faith partaking luxuriously and ordinarily of any drinks of an intoxicating quality. *Perhaps* not, then, we say. But neither did hospitals, colleges, Bible societies, missionary institutions, Sabbath schools, and fifty other right and lawful things prevail then as now. To make your argument of any value, even were we to admit the accuracy of the alleged fact you found on, you must put the apostolic time on the same platform as the present, so far, at least, as drinks, drinking, and drunkenness are concerned. There was then no whisky, brandy, gin, rum, sack, known; no port, sherry, burgundy, champagne, or other "doctored" wines, in common use, and sanctioned and partaken of by the good and respectable in society among the Jews. There were no houses of common resort specially set apart for the systematic drinking of these things;

no "public-houses" licensed by a paternal (?) government, *for this and no other purpose;* the domestic and social customs of Judea were not soaked and saturated in alcohol; drunkards were not to be found in every gutter; and drunkenness was not the special pest and shame of the nation, plunging it into crime, and poverty, and death. Make our respective eras equal as to these things; and then institute a fair comparison as to the needfulness for such means of social reform as we now advocate. Not till then.

"But," it may be said, "in apostolic times the Greeks had fallen greatly away from their former sobriety, and the Gentile nations in general were given to sensual profligacy of every sort. Why, then, have we no special directions to them in harmony with your views?" To this we reply, by referring to what has been already said; that the epistles teach great principles which involve such self-denial and self-control; that in more than one passage the literal interpretation of words implies command rather than inference to that effect; and that, on a review of their character, circumstances, and conduct, with such elucidation of these as tradition may be permitted to give, we have good reason to believe that Peter and Paul would not only have been Nephalists in our day, but actually were so in their own. As "apostles of the Gentiles," they *could* not else have

been "all things to all men" in the fervent discharge of their glorious calling.

Silence in scripture as to any particular sin or duty, as little implies the non-existence of the one, as the non-incumbency of the other. In the Epistle to the Colossians, Paul enumerates the offences from which the converts are to abstain; but drunkenness is not mentioned. At the same time, he gives a list of those virtues and graces which they were specially to practice, and yet says nothing of sobriety. From this we are not to infer, either that there were no drunkards in Colosse, or that there was any exemption there from the duty of temperance. And, in like manner, should we find even in all his writings to the Gentiles, no special exhortation to Nephalism, this were no warrant for concluding that he did not expect them to deduce the propriety of such conduct, from the leading points and principles of Christian duty with which he had already made them acquainted.

"*There was wine at the institution of the Lord's Supper.*" Does any one really find a difficulty there? If so, is it not enough to remind him that the evangelists never use the word "wine" at all, in connection with this sacred ordinance? The phrase is invariably the fruit of the vine" (γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου.) The apostles, in alluding to it, use always the word

"cup" (ποτήριον). In the services of the altar, in the old dispensation, the meats and drinks used were ordinarily without leaven and ferment; this being the first stage of putrefaction, and inconsistent, consequently, with representing Him who was infinitely pure and holy in Himself, and neither held nor saw corruption. At the present day, the *strict* Jews, in the feast of the Passover, use no fermented wine, but wine made for the purpose out of raisins. And in view of these things, is there not a plain indication given of the nature of the sacrificial wine used, when, as He handed the cup to His disciples, He said, "I will not drink hereafter of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it *new* with you in my Father's kingdom?"

Is it argued that the wine originally used at the Supper must have been intoxicating, because Paul (1. Cor. xi. 20.) accuses the Corinthian church of drunkenness? "This is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating, every one *taketh before other his own supper;* and one is hungry, and another μεθύει." The offence here laid to their charge may be, not that of intoxication, but the converting of the sacred ordinance into an ordinary meal, so unequally and irregularly conducted as to lead to one man being empty while another is *full;* and hence the exhortation that follows:—"What! have you not *houses* to eat and drink in?" &c. Or, if the apostle's meaning

is, really to impute to them the crime of obvious excess in the use of intoxicants on that solemn occasion, this would only show how fast and how far that church had fallen, as to both outward *ritual* and inner life, from their original purity.

"*There is no scriptural command for Nephalism.*" That matter has been already so far discussed in these pages. We are prepared to maintain that Nephalism is to be deduced from, and is in point of fact enjoined by the teaching of the Bible. At the same time, we are ready to admit that there is no distinct, special, separate commandment to that effect, in so many words. But then, neither is there any like command against slavery, or in favour of the change of day in observance of the Sabbath. These important and essential parts of our religious belief and practice are not more plainly—if so plainly—set forth in the Bible than is Nephalism. Americans in the South "wrest the scriptures" skilfully, and seem to satisfy themselves at all events, that slavery is a heaven-born institution. And the secularists do likewise here, against our alleged superstition in the holy observance of the Lord's-day. We claim for Nephalism the same position, in this respect, as we do for Sabbath observance and hatred of slavery. And we join in repudiating that resource of the would-be-free of all

restraint, morally and spiritually, which is so well denounced in the following words of Dr Candlish: "We have greatly to fear a style of interpretation of scripture which is resorted to by those who are peculiarly anxious to limit its authority. It is this. There is a class of interpreters who insist upon everything being proved out of scripture by plain and explicit statements. They say that it is of no use to reason upon the scriptures. You need not point to show what is involved in scripture; you need not draw arguments from scripture; you need not plead the authority of the apostles or their example, unless you can show, with chapter and verse, the express and unequivocal deliverance fully upon the point. Now, this is the most dangerous of all the forms of incipient infidelity. It was, therefore, with great wisdom that the compilers of our standards inserted into these standards a declaration, that whatsoever can be proved by argument from scripture, while not contained in explicit terms in the scriptures, must be held to be an intimation of the mind of God, and, as such, binding upon us. The holy scriptures were composed for men—men having understanding—men capable of reasoning, and of intelligent deduction of principles. The holy scriptures are an announcement, not of points and details, but of broad, general principles." And, moreover, while these *principles* are for all time, it

is obvious that the *details of practice* to be deduced from them may require to vary, in form, though never in kind, according to change of time and circumstance.

It behoves us also to remember this pregnant saying, "*There are also many other things which Jesus did*, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." (John xxi. 25.) And while you argue that "there is no scripture command for Nephalism," remember this—*there is no scripture command against it.*

"*But the Bible commends wine; and may I not partake of what is therein commended?*" Look to the word translated "wine," as well as to the general bearing of the passage; and ascertain what really is commended. "Wine, that cheereth God and man," is often quoted, for example, as a commendation of wine in the present day. How stands the fact? The word here translated "wine" is *tirosh*, the solid produce of the vine. It is Jotham's parable of the vine speaking to the trees, which "went forth to anoint a king over them." "Should I leave my *tirosh*," replies the vine to their offer, "which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees?" (Judges ix. 13.) The idea is the same as in this other—"Corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine

(*tirosh* again) the maids." (Zech. ix. 17.) In this last passage, to adopt any other interpretation than what we indicate, and is indeed quite obvious, drives the expounder to sad shifts; of which we have a memorable instance in a Highland teacher, who finding this verse in his way, is said to have explained it thus—"How *new wine* should make the maids cheerful, poor things, is plain enough; but how *corn*, in the ordinary signification of the word, could have the same effect on *young men*, is not conceivable, seeing that they are not of the nature of horses. The word 'corn' must obviously be used metaphorically here; meaning what is produced or extracted from it, of an exhilarating kind; and therefore it is very plain that *whisky is allowed in the Scriptures*."

"*Use is right; abuse is wrong. Does the abuse of wine and strong drink by some, warrant a demand for the negation of its use by all?*" Certainly; if your conscience is to rule your conduct; if the thing in question be no necessary of life, but a mere luxury at the best, the discontinuance of which may ruffle the appetite for a while, but will benefit the discontinuer in all other respects; and if the *abuse*, which leads to such cessation of *use*, be not limited to a few, but pervade the whole nation as a pestilence—and that of the most formidable and fatal kind.

College discipline supplies an apt enough illustration of the principle here involved, though on a very minor scale. What more pure and innocent than snow; and what more harmless and yet exhilarating than a romping game of snowballing—at time and place fitting? Yet, within academic walls, it is found to lead to accidents and misrule; not always, perhaps, but often; and on account of these occasional mishaps, the authorities most wisely enjoin that snowballing shall be absolutely and altogether abstained from.

If fungi were plentiful in the land, of a most seductive and poisonous kind, and the people by hundreds and thousands, in search of mushrooms, were eating these promiscuously, and sickening, pining, dying in consequence—would it not be well for the authorities to interfere, and not only to dissuade from, but to interdict, all mushroom-hunting for the future? Ketchup is not a necessary of life. As little is alcohol.

"*But the pledge! this vow! It is a wrong thing; and I cannot conscientiously take it.*" Very well. Be a Nephalist without it. The pledge is a help to many, and union gives strength; but neither pledges nor association are essential. It is enough that you resolve to be a Nephalist, and, in virtue of that resolve, abstain.

In joining an association, by adhibiting your name

as a member, and testifying your adhesion to its rules, you do no more than is done every day, by you and such as you, in joining any society or association—whether it be for pleasure, or business, or religion, or social reform—whether it be a debating club, or a volunteer corps, or an Excelsior society. You may resign next day. The signing of your name involves no self-surrender, like the entering of the cloister. You are free to come and go, to abide or depart. As formerly stated, you merely announce and declare your assertion of Christian liberty to deny yourself a dangerous indulgence, for your own sake and for that of the general community. Looking around, you become convinced that such conduct on your part is "good for the present distress;" your intellectual conviction is, that in this "The Lord hath need of you;" and casting behind you all fear that hath bondage, as well as all false shame, you seek and obtain the moral courage that is needful for acting out your part, as a Christian and a man.

Even if your act partook more of the nature of a vow than it does, would it be on that account sinful? If the thing vowed is right, surely there is no harm in vowing it unto the Lord! Sin will be not in the vowing, but in the failure to pay the vow. "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for He hath no pleasure in fools; pay that which thou hast

vowed. Better it is that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay." (Eccl. v. 4, 5.) Does any one lay hold of that latter statement, and say, "Yes—that's it—it is better not to vow, than to vow and fail; and, therefore, it is wise and prudent in me to keep upon the safe side by abiding as I am,"—is not this a "wresting of scripture" which may be made against every duty and responsibility alike? Is it not very often employed, for instance, in lulling a sleepy soul into the torpor of death, in regard to the most solemn religious observances! Have we not often heard a man say, "I refrain from partaking of the Lord's Supper, lest I fall away from my vows there made. It is better, on the whole, that I should stay away."

If vows to do right are sinful, David was a greater sinner than we have yet taken him for. "Vow, and pay unto the Lord your God" (Ps. lxxvi. 11) is a mandate which he seems to take to himself quite literally. He was constantly vowing and paying—"I will pay my vows," says he, "before them that fear him." (Ps. xxii. 25). "I will pay thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my mouth hath spoken, when I was in trouble." (Ps. lxvi. 13, 14.)

Either Paul or Aquila, too, had a vow, when he shaved his head in Cenchrea. And most certainly the former was ready to take a sweeping one of the

nature now indicated, when he protested thus—"If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh *while the world standeth*, lest I make my brother to offend." (1 Cor. viii. 13).*

But it is idle to argue this question further; the fact being that under no circumstances is either vow or pledge, or even association, essential. What is wanted is the practice—action. In many circumstances, however, more especially among the working classes, with whom temptation is so great, the written subscription, or "pledge," as it is called, is of much service; not merely as a support to the tempted, but rather as an answer to the tempter—"Come and take a glass." "No." "Why?" "I have taken the pledge: there it is." To such an answer no man, having any pretension to probity and honour, would make any other return than unqualified submission. Under such circumstances, to repeat and urge the tempting, is the part of no gentleman, but of a boorish groundling and an arrant knave —or, perhaps, a fool; nay—of no man, but of a devil.

* "Such was Paul's respect for expediency—by which we mean not a selfish, or political, but Christian expediency, or what is best and most expedient for the good of human souls—that on his mind, and on every mind such as his, of highest spiritual philanthropy and patriotism, it is an expediency which acts with all the force of a most urgent obligation; and hence the noble declaration regarding what in itself he held to be a thing of indifference." Chalmers.

By joining an association or company of Nephalists, on the other hand, the benefit of our name and influence—be it great or small—is given to the good cause; and by the union strength is obtained, not only in mutual support, defensively, but also in combined power, aggressively, against the common foe.

"*But how can I be hospitable? How can I receive, and still more, how can I give hospitality, without partaking of these things—of course in moderation?*" The mere fact that you find such a difficulty in giving and taking hospitality, without the use of intoxicants, constitutes the strongest possible argument in favour of your adoption of Nephalism. "There is something rotten in the social state;" and it is your business to do what you can to put it right. This absurd idea of hospitality being, as chemists say, "soluble only in alcohol," is the strongest fibre in that strong root of national intemperance—the drinking customs; and it must be severed.

"You cannot enjoy yourselves otherwise?" Does your enjoyment, then, depend on animal spirits, or on British spirits? Is it a reality of the mind, or only a fiction of the bottle?

"You cannot shew your kindness and friendship otherwise?" Is it either kind or friendly to put an enemy into your neighbour's mouth, to steal away his

brains? to press upon him that which he does not need, and which, by an inexorable law of nature, will consequently, if taken, injure him? The sight of two men "over their bottle" looks more like a "hostile meeting," than a meeting of friends; more like a duel than anything else—with this aggravation, that while in the duel one or both *may* escape, in this the mutual delivery of fire cannot fail to hit; both must be injured, more or less; and the wounds, though mayhap not mortal at the time, too often lay the foundation for that festering, cancerous sore that eats ere long into the very heart. A bottle may be as fatal as a bullet, *through the brain.*

It looks "scrubby and mean," does it, to withhold this refreshment? Then spend your money in some other and more sensible way; for the benefit of one or of both, and for the injury of neither. Or if you, the host, will not be thus amenable to common-sense, let the guest take the matter into his own hand, as Theodore Hook is reported to have done on one occasion. An alderman made a great feast for this gentleman's special behoof and honour. Dish after dish, and bottle after bottle, came crowding in; and the host's satisfaction seemed pretty equally divided, between the stuffing of himself and the seeing of his friend stuffed too. But nature appoints limits to these things, and by and by Hook could take no more; he

was full. To his horror, however, the door opening ushered in another dish, more portentous-looking than any of its predecessors. "Now," said the host, rubbing his hands in delight, "now comes the most *recherchée* part of the entertainment, Mr Hook—let me help you at once." "Beg pardon, beg pardon," faintly articulated the already choking Hook—"but I positively have dined, and literally can hold no more." "What! not taste this, that has cost me both money and pains to procure for you! I shall take it as a personal affront." "Well, it must be a very little," said the meekly submissive Hook. "I shall endeavour to manage a little." Pop then went a cork, behind his chair. "Here is the Burgundy, Mr Hook—*the* Burgundy, the true accompaniment of such a lordly dish; pledge me in a bumper, a real bumper." "On my honour, I *cannot*. I have done what I could to oblige you, in a friendly way; but one mouthful, solid or fluid, I cannot swallow more." "Intolerable!" exclaimed the now truly indignant alderman. "This is too bad, sir; that I should put myself to such trouble and cost to procure these dainties for you—all for you; and then you refuse ———." "Well, well!" gasped Hook, with one hand controlling his heaving throat, while the other was held out with open palm —"Well, well, sir—*I'll take the rest in money.*"

In *giving* hospitality, there need be no practical

difficulty. Keep "spirits" for the medicine chest alone; and have no alcoholics on the table. After dinner, produce coffee and tea immediately; and avoid, as poisons of a minor degree, all "temperance drinks" made of syrups, robs, and such like trash.

The late Mayor of Dublin, Mr Atkinson, found his Nephalism in no degree incompatible with his entertainments at the mansion house: "I feel quite assured," says he, "that none of my guests felt the least annoyed, because I, and others who were also abstainers, drank cold water instead of wine."

The identifying of wine and strong drink with hospitality and social enjoyment is very perilous to children. It engenders in them a desire for these things—sometimes even a remarkable craving; not evidencing thereby a natural appetite, but showing how powerfully the example of their parents and others has affected them with the conviction, that these drinks are both inseparable from, and essential to, all social pleasure: a false belief which has led to many a brave spirit's ruin, temporal and eternal. Nothing can be more absurd, as well as pernicious, than the "treating" of children to a glass of wine, on Sundays, on birth-days, and on other great occasions; as if it were really something good, and even grand. In this view, Nephalism is a double blessing; casting no such snare before the unwary, and leading the young

in a safe way from the first. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it."

This is a principle, indeed, which many an Anti-Nephalist respects and acts upon. Unable to abandon his own long-accustomed indulgence without a struggle which he does not care to face, he is yet most anxious that his children should not enter upon the dangerous path even by a single step, and counsels them accordingly; forgetting—or seeming to forget—how all his precept goes for nought, and less than nought, under the paramount influence of his example—"which is contrary."

"*But my state of health absolutely requires a little stimulus. My doctor tells me so, and I must obey him.*" Quite right. I have a fellow-feeling with you there, for I have been in the same predicament myself, at a time; medical men of highest repute enjoining "a little wine for the stomach's sake, and often infirmities," and my own conviction coinciding with the accuracy of their proposal. But that is no reason why you or I should not become, or continue, a Nephalist. I am not more truly such, in full tide of total abstinence, during ordinary health, than when, under the necessity of sickness, I partake carefully of medicines of an alcoholic kind. Seldom, however, if ever, with

anything like due care, does such medicinal necessity exist for a lifetime, or even for any protracted period, as some are apt to suppose. Under proper treatment, medicinal and hygienic, the crisis and its necessities pass away. And it is your business and mine, 1. To prevent such necessities, in the first instance, by regulation of work, diet, and exercise. 2. To make sure that the necessity is real, not apparent; and that the alcoholic form of medicine is certainly required. 3. To regulate the dose with conscientious care, both as to amount and continuance. 4. To take such measures, promptly, as shall be most likely to remove the weakness or disease, and send us back to our abstinence "*pur et simple*," once more.

Those who persist in maintaining, notwithstanding all this, that they cannot join our corps, render themselves liable to the suspicion that it is not the *stomach* but the *palate* for which they really plead; and that their "little wine" cannot, therefore, be covered by the prescription given to Timothy.

Another says, "*I take a little wine to prevent my stomach's weakness, and that is better than taking it for the cure.*" Friend, you have got hold of a wrong therapeutic principle; or, rather, it has got hold of you. Take heed, lest, ere you are aware, it do you a grievous injury. Some preventions may be *worse*

instead of better than cures. Remedies that cure seldom prevent (p. 18). The necessity for exhibition must have already occurred, ere the law of tolerance will guarantee either impunity or relief by the dose. Alcoholics in health will not prevent, but produce disease. "A slow poison, sir," you gaily and banteringly reply. "Yes; but not the less sure."

The best exception we know to the rule under consideration, is in regard to this same Nephalism. For drunkenness, it is essential to the *cure;* impunity and benefit alike flowing from its protracted and perfect observance; whilst as a *preventive* of intemperance, it is, under God's blessing, infallible.

"*Among the masses, many take the pledge, but few keep it.*" All the more need of you and me, to accompany and strengthen them in their purpose. Falling back, if left to themselves, they may prove stanch and steadfast if well supported. At the Redan, as men were wavering amid the heaps of dead and dying, the call was, "Where are the supports? Send on the supports!" And had our brave troops been duly supported that day, the Redan would have been their own. If others—brave men too—are faltering and giving way in the deadly conflict with a mightier foe than ever was the Muscovite, *we* are neither brave nor true men, if, holding back, we refuse that moral

countenance and support which their strait demands, which the righteousness of their cause not merely sanctions but consecrates, and without which they may fail utterly—blood lying at our door.

"*A man pledges, and breaks his pledge; you restore him, and he breaks again. You restore him still. Thus you debauch his conscience.*" Again, we say, come and help us to help him! Besides, your principle will not hold good. Apply it to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A partaker having fallen through strength of temptation, will you not repone him afterwards, on due evidence of contrition and repentance, with a striving after new obedience? "To the Law and to the Testimony!" What say they? "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times; but, until seventy times seven." (Mat. xviii. 22.) There is many a soul now rejoicing in Christian liberty, once bondsman to the fell tyrant drink, who after many and sore falls has at length got strength to hold and pay his vow.

"*We want proofs of Nephalism's efficacy, especially in territorial and home mission work.*" In reply—1 We point to the fact that town missionaries, almost without exception, are Nephalists, from the conviction

of this attitude on their part being essential to their usefulness. The cry from heathen lands, too, is growing more and more general towards coming helpers—"Unless he is an abstainer, his usefulness here will be greatly impaired." 2. We appeal to the experience of our home missionaries—especially in towns; or, at least, to all who are intelligent, consistent, and faithful. Some there may be who with the best intentions lack mournfully the essential element of common sense—"pious blockheads," as Dr Chalmers called them, and whom he ranked among the dangerous classes of society. But of all who with zeal and piety associate prudence and discretion, we claim their experience, in this matter, as wholly on our side. 3. We point to the faithful chronicles of home mission works, in the various publications of the day; more especially to that simple and touching story of a woman's love—"Haste to the Rescue." A Christian minister and his curates, in the town of Shrewsbury, fail to impress the masses, despite the entire force of due ecclesiastical machinery. His wife takes up the cause; and, Bible in hand, goes down to the work—hating teetotalism, and with no love for teetotalers. She finds, however, that teetotalism on their part is essential to her success; and, open to the teachings of experience, she impresses its practice upon her people. A certain measure of good follows; but soon it be-

comes apparent that her own example and companionship are required in this matter; and, though going against her original convictions, generously she yields to the demand. The good work then thrives apace; all prejudice and prepossession give way; self denial is rewarded in success; and we find this noble lady—a convert to Nephalism through her own personal experience of its working—at length expressing herself thus—"*I could no more now be a Christian and not a total abstainer, than I could be a Christian and a drunkard.*" Her converts, not only to sobriety, but to religion, she counts not by units but by hundreds. And her husband thankfully acknowledges, in great singleness of heart, "*You have solved a problem which I have been years trying to make out—how to get hold of the working classes.*"

"*Teetotalers are very busy, and seem to be doing a great deal of work. Why is there so little fruit? Why so little impression made upon the prevalence of drunkenness?*" To this we answer,—1. By taking the liberty of quoting the well-known proverb, that half-done work should not be judged of hastily. This is a sowing time; the reaping will come hereafter, in its due season. And all eyes, not blinded by prejudice, may already see, if they will but look, not only the blade but also the ear, and even the full

corn in the ear. An early harvest has already been gathered in, with much thankfulness and rejoicing. 2. One main reason why the success has not been greater is—your obstructiveness. The work suffers opposition, both indirect and direct, secret and avowed, from Belial and the sons of Belial. With that we quarrel not. We lay our account with it, as that which is to be expected in the nature of things; and, in one sense, we regard its activity as the evidence and measure of our progress. But what we dread most, and with good reason, is the coldness of lukewarm, half-hearted friends, and the bad word of those from whom, as among the sober, respectable, and intelligent of the land, we looked, if not for help, at least for countenance. Seeking earnestly and diligently to sustain our fire, we are content to watch and frustrate our enemy's efforts to scatter the coals and kindling; but we assert a right to grumble when ever and anon our flame is reduced to smoke and blackness by buckets of cold water, thrown recklessly on by the hands of those who should be friends to this and every other honest means of social and moral improvement. To such we say,—If you will not help our cause, at least let it alone! Give us a fair field, as well as your "no favour!" If you won't, or can't, say anything for us, don't say anything against us! Take Gamaliel's advice: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone;

for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

"*Your system is too extreme, in a common-sense point of view,*" say some. "*If it does not go against nature, it goes against universal and long-continued custom, at least, and there is great danger of a reaction. Men cooped up within your stern bindings for a time, will break out some day into greater excesses than before. You must pitch your aim lower to succeed.*" We are familiar with the same argument on another question; coming from opponents, who, in reference to "the social evil," think the advocates of absolute purity altogether Utopian. "The evil must exist, more or less," they say; "you cannot put it down wholly. Cease to attempt an impossibility, and take to what is feasible and practicable, giving it order and moderation." The answer in both cases is the same. Is what we propose right and true? in harmony with science and scripture and common sense—the last named being restored to its genuine purity, and stripped of the adventitious and false mould which custom and prejudice have imparted to it? Then act the proposal out; leaving the issues in His hands, whose commands you honour and obey. Therein is duty; therein is safety; and therein, too, is success. Even

according to your own tortuous scheme of expediency, this is the way most likely to result in what you seek, namely, diminution of the evil; according to the Scottish proverb, "Bode a gown o' gowd, and ye'll aye get a sleeve o't."

The objection, however, is valuable in one aspect; it directs our attention to the great duty of dealing specially with the young. In those of advanced years habit is confirmed. Were they all Nephalists to-morrow, there would no doubt be great fear of a reaction. Habit would constantly be counteracting principle; and the greatest effort would be needful against lapse and loss. Be intent on those, then, on whom the habit has not begun to form. By training of body and mind, in their yet virgin estate, establish such simplicity of appetite and desire as Nephalism implies; and then our youth, growing up to manhood, will find no irksome bondage in abstaining from that for which they have no liking, and of which they have never known the want. A friend dined at my table lately, between fifty and sixty years of age, who had been a Nephalist from his birth; never having, in all his life, tasted one drop of intoxicating liquor. Let us have a generation of such as he, and we need not fear "reaction."

Meanwhile, let us do what we can, in all departments of work, making sure of the right way, and

walking in it—restraining, by all means, the adult, and pre-eminently interested in protecting the rising generation.

But, enough of these "objections" and "difficulties." We have singled out the best and strongest we could find. In our conscientious opinion—though some of them were once held by ourselves, and acted on in all honesty—they do not weigh one feather's weight against the principles of Nephalism.

For conscientious objectors we have great respect; but there are others whose excuses are vain—"frivolous and vexatious;" the insincerity of them but thinly disguised, and putting one in mind of certain apologies sent long ago in answer to an invitation to a great supper—"I have bought a piece of ground, and must needs go to see it: I pray thee have *me* excused." "I have bought five yoke of oxen," says a second, "and I go to prove them, I pray thee have *me* excused." And another said, "I have married a wife, and therefore *I* cannot come." (Luke xiv. 16, &c.) Obviously they did not — could not — expect the giver of the feast to accept such transparent insufficiencies as these; and they did not care more closely to conceal the truth, that their absence arose not from any real difficulty in complying with the invitation, but in dislike of the feast and of the giver of it.

May we be permitted to state, very briefly, one or two objections which, we are convinced, are often felt and real, though not expressed?

Some of the Real Objections.

They like the drink. To want it would be to lose a friend, or rather a companion, to whose society they have been long accustomed, and without which they would find the world wag wondrous wearily. The first stage of enslavement—perhaps the second—has already got hold of them; and for their own sake it is high time they threw off the enslaver. A French soldier of the old guard had a grievous wound of the chest; and to the surgeons, deeply probing it, he quietly said—"A little deeper, gentlemen, and you will find the Emperor." Napoleon the Great ruled supreme in that man's heart. Let those we now speak of submit to a like examination — morally; a little deeper they may find the demon—their emperor. Cut out his image and superscription from the heart, while there is yet time!

In conversation with an eminent clergyman the other day, we were told "If any man care more for a glass of toddy than for a plate of broth, he ought to abandon strong drink for ever, for his own sake."

Apply this principle rigidly, and the influx to Nephalism will be enormous.

There is a want of due benevolence. They identify the sin and the sinner, and despise both. They will not put themselves about for such a ruffian as that—wallowing in the kennel, or murdering his wife, or blaspheming his God. They will not dirty their hands on him. And if they intromit with him at all, it will only be at a distance; shouting out social, economic, and sanitary maxims, for his behoof; it may be flinging morsels of what they call the Gospel at his head; or, pulling themselves up erect, they adjure him to "look at me, and be as I am." "Come up here, you ruffian, and be cured! Learn the Gospel, sir, and be religious! Take example by me and other respectable men, and learn to restrain your appetite as a rational being!" Go down to him, we say, and be at personal charges with him! Give him your hand, aye, and your heart too! Help him up! Cease to rail and scold; try to constrain him by love! Don't drive, but draw! Loathe the sin, but love the sinner!

They hate, or at least dislike teetotalism and teetotalers. The former is vulgar, ascetic, bigoted, absurd. The latter are a vain, self-sufficient, suspicious, un-

scrupulous pack, who have no great amount of brains, and are most certainly devoid of all bowels of Christian charity and brotherly love. With some of them they have had collisions too, and sustained personal affront.

Look again, gentlemen, at both—the thing and its abettors. I remember the day when I was somewhat thus minded. But the more I have looked at Nephalism, in the light of Bible truth, the more I have liked it; and the more I have mingled with Nephalists, and compared them with others, the more I have been led to respect their motives and admire their conduct; finding them as a class, self-denying, single-hearted, generous, true philanthropists—ready for, and busy in, not only this, but all other good work for the welfare and happiness of their fellowmen.

Grant that there are men of an opposite character among them! What then? Was there not a Judas among the twelve? And were they anything the less apostles of the truth? In what congregation, and in what church, are there not many Judases? And is the presence of these to disprove and discredit all the great truths of Christianity, barring out men of reason from their embrace?

If bad men do mingle among the adherents of a good cause, it is the business of good men, as already

said, to press in on the other side, and neutralise them.

They are ignorant of the question in its true extent and bearings. They have not studied it; some through inadvertence, some of set purpose; they do not wish to be disturbed in their comfortable custom, and sometimes they are honest enough to say so. Such are without excuse; and yet they are many in the land.

Some want moral power. They have studied the question; they are convinced of its truth; they would abandon their alcoholic custom if they could, but they cannot. The drug has already done its work, so far as not only to hold the body servile to the lust, but to show the mental and moral nature shorn, to no slight extent, of its conscientiousness, and wholly deprived of its self-control. It is high time they were begun to the work of reaction, and that in earnest, while it is still "to-day." The night may be soon upon them, dark, dismal, despairing, without a hope of dawn.

But let them not trust to their own strength. The adversary is more powerful than they. And to enter the strong man's house and spoil his goods, the strong man must first be bound—by one stronger

than he. "Not by might, not by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Some want moral courage. They are convinced, and would act up to their conviction, but they dare not. They are not slaves to the drug, but slaves to their fellow-men. The collar of Cedric the Saxon is on their necks—they are serfs. Who shall make them free? "The fear of man bringeth a snare, but whoso *putteth his trust in the Lord* shall be safe." "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Does any timid spirit despair of ever getting courage enough? Then let him try Love. It was not the bold, and almost blustering Peter, that stood nearest to his Lord when surrounded by enemies thirsting for his blood. It was the loving disciple, John. "It must require great courage," said one to Mrs Wightman, in reference to her labour among the heathen at home. "No, it does not; *it requires love*, and that's a thing few people possess for these poor brothers and sisters. I cannot account for it;* *but I love them with all my heart, and they know it.*"†

* The accounting for it is simple enough. The second commandment springs out of the first. Loving the Lord her God with all her heart, and with all her soul, and with all her strength, and with all her mind, she could not help loving her neighbour as herself.

† "Haste to the Rescue."

"There is no fear in love; perfect love casteth out fear."

It is a goodly sight to see a man proving all things, and holding fast that which is good; abstaining from all appearance of evil, and keeping himself unspotted from the world; doing no injury to mind or body through sensual indulgence, and dedicating his whole nature, in its integrity, to the service of his God.

It is a goodly sight to see a strong man affectionately tending his fallen brother—weak, and blind, and fearful. Heart and limbs have alike failed him; he is groping feebly for the way; and, left to himself, he would fain lie down and die. But his brother is near, and helps him on. "This way; this way! Foot for foot, I go with you. Rest on me, and be of good heart. Snares and pitfalls are all around you, are they? We will avoid them together. Men are gibing and mocking at you, are they? They must mock and gibe at me too; and let them beware! Lions are in the path, are they? There is an Arm that can scare them all away. That is your Strength —and mine! Look up, brother—look up! Give me your hand again; and with the other lean hard on Him who is our Elder Brother—born for this adversity! So! courage now, brother, and on! Let fools

or fiends mock at us as they may, there is hope—there is life yet!"

It were a goodlier sight still, to see the noble, generous, glowing heart of such an one taking up a wider and loftier range; not limiting his self-denying efforts to his own flesh and blood, and to those of his own house; but, like a valiant Great Heart, companying with all who need and take the help of his heart and hand. Then is he the true Christian; then is he the true man. God give me grace to be such as he!

APPENDIX.

I HAVE been much interested in perusing a "Brief Memoir of the Author of 'The Sinner's Friend,'" * written by his son, the Rev. Newman Hall. And I take leave to introduce here the following extract from it, as bearing powerfully on some of the points treated of in the preceding pages—more particularly, the necessity of abstinence from *all* alcoholic drinks, on the part of the penitent; the danger of influential example, by "moderate drinking," on the part of others; the heavy responsibility, in this respect, that rests specially on ministers; and the help which abstinence gives in resisting temptation, *even in the case of the apparently converted:*—

"In spite of his better judgment, the injury to his worldly interests, his desire to be esteemed by his friends, his ardent affection for his wife, together with his religious convictions, he frequently felt his old habit taking possession of him with demon-power.

* A book which has been translated into almost every language, and has reached a circulation of upwards of 1,500,000 copies.

There were then no Total Abstinence Societies which might shield him with their sympathy and example. When every one drank, was it to be expected he would abstain? The advice generally given was—'Use, but not abuse.' Yet with his peculiar temperament and habits, one glass would so rouse his appetite that self-control was gone, and he rushed forward to the abyss which, when perfectly sober, he abhorred.

"One of these sad relapses occurred on occasion of a young minister visiting the house and taking brandy and water at luncheon. My father, thinking there could be no harm in following such an example, filled his own glass, and was again overcome. While I mention this I am reminded of a man who appealed to me a few years ago for succour. He told me he was once a respected and popular minister—but that coming to London, his first evening was spent in the company of several other ministers whose 'moderate' indulgence in wine and spirits, led him to habits of tippling which ended in ministerial ruin and beggary. I also know of a similar case in Yorkshire. A young man had been reclaimed from drunkenness by means of 'total abstinence.' A minister coming to visit at the house, persuaded him to join in a glass of wine, saying that the entire disuse was going to an extreme, and a neglect of a 'good creature of God.' The young man, whom similar persuasion from a person less respected would not have influenced, fell into the snare unintentionally laid for him. That one glass awoke the slumbering fiend. He rushed out to the public house, whence he was brought home intoxi-

cated, and from that time was again the wretched slave of strong drink. Can any one, in the face of such facts, condemn or deride those who, not needing entire abstinence as a preservative to themselves, renounce all indulgence in intoxicating drinks for the sake of those who, humanly speaking, if they are not to drink wine to excess, must not drink it at all?

"The case here described shows that there may be the true commencement of a divine life in the soul, although old sins may frequently re-assert their power. We must not hastily discard as insincere, those who while professing repentance, fall again into the snare of the devil. Through many years, divine grace and an easily besetting sin strove for the mastery. But at length he was enabled to say—'Thanks be to God who hath given me the victory.'

"It may be questioned whether simple abstinence would not have been equally effectual without any medicine. When the prescription was first taken, wine and spirits were given up. But it was found that beer was sufficient to excite the morbid propensity. After several failures from this cause, beer also was relinquished. Then it was, and not till then, that the cure was complete. From the day that *all* intoxicating beverages were renounced, the old temptation was powerless—the very inclination to excess ceased to be felt. Till his death (forty-two years), not a drop of intoxicating liquor ever passed his tongue. He lost all desire for it—the taste, the smell became, physically as well as morally, hateful."

TEMPERANCE WORKS

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE

Scottish Temperance League,

108 HOPE STREET, GLASGOW.

Single Copies sent on receipt of Postage Stamps to the amount.

The Temperance Cyclopædia. By the Rev. William Reid, Edinburgh. Price 5s, Post Free.

Our National Vice. By the Rev. William Reid, Edinburgh. Price 6d, 1s, 1s 6d, and 2s, Post Free.

Alcohol: Its Place and Power. By James Miller, F.R.S.E., F.R.C.S.E., Surgeon in Ordinary to the Queen for Scotland, Surgeon in Ordinary to His Royal Highness Prince Albert for Scotland, Professor of Surgery in the University of Edinburgh. Price 6d, 1s, 1s 6d, and 2s, Post Free.

The City: Its Sins and Sorrows. By the Rev. Dr Guthrie, Edinburgh. Price 1s, 1s 6d, and 2s, Post Free.

Glimpses of Real Life. By the Author of the "Burnish Family." Price 6d, 1s, and 2s, Post Free.

Woman's Work for Woman's Weal. By the Rev. Wm. Reid, Edinburgh. Price 3d, and 6d, Post Free.

The Temperance Pulpit; A Series of Discourses, by Ministers of Various Denominations. Price 2s, Post Free. This Volume has been prepared to supply the want of appropriate readings for Sabbath Evening Temperance Meetings. The Sermons may be had separately, price 2d each.

The Adaptations of Temperance, in a Series of Addresses. Price 1s, Post Free. Each of these Addresses may also be had separately, price 1d, or 6s per 100.

The Drunkard's Progress. Being a Panorama of the Overland Route from the Station ot Drouth to the General Terminus in the Dead Sea. In a Series of Thirteen Views. Drawn and Engraved by John Adam. The Descriptions by John Bunyan, Junior. Cheap and Enlarged Edition, Price 8d, Post Free.

A Friendly Appeal to Moderate-Drinking Minis- ters. By an Abstaining One. Price One Half-penny, or 3s per 100. Eight Copies sent on receipt of Four Postage Stamps.

The Physiological Errors of Moderation. By William B. Carpenter, M.D., F.R.S., F.G.S., Examiner in Physiology in the University of London; Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in University College, &c., &c., &c. Price 2d, Post Free on receipt of Three Stamps. "A comprehensive and conclusive defence of abstinence."—*Commonwealth.* "As interesting as a tale, yet is scientific in the best sense of the word, and is likely to leave conviction in its wake in passing through any unprejudiced mind."—*Alliance Weekly News.*

PRIZE TEMPERANCE TALES.

£100 Prize Tale—Danesbury House. By Mrs Henry Wood. Being the Temperance Tale for which One Hundred Pounds was unanimously awarded by the Adjudicators. Post Free, price 1s, 1s 6d, and 2s.

The Burnish Family. Being the Temperance Tale for which the First Prize has been unanimously awarded by the Adjudicators. Post Free, price 6d, 1s, 1s 6d, and 2s.

The Fortunes of Fairleigh. Being the Temperance Tale for which the Second Prize was unanimously awarded by the Adjudicators. Post Free, price 1s, 1s 6d, and 2s.

Cousin Alice. The Prize Juvenile Tale. Post Free, price 6d, 1s, 1s 6d, and 2s.

The following Series of Volumes, Free by Post, Price, Paper Covers, 6d ; Cloth, 1s ; Cloth Gilt, 1s 6d.

Ten Nights in a Bar-Room, and What I Saw There. By T. S. Arthur. "One of the most soul-stirring narratives lately issued from the Press."—*Kelso Chronicle.*

Three Nights with the Washingtonians. By T. S. Arthur. "They are, almost without exception, the best temperance stories that we have seen."—*Falkirk Herald.*

Passages from the History of a Wasted Life. This Tale is illustrated with Eight First-Class Wood Engravings. "It is unquestionably one of the most interesting works ever issued by the League."—*Commonwealth.*

Fast Life; or the City and the Farm. "It chained us to our seat till we had got through it, and that is what few tales could do. It deserves, and we doubt not will command, a wide circulation."—*Bristol Temperance Herald.*

The Lathams. "The Lathams is a singularly felicitous story. Choice in incident, elegant in language, brimful of humour and unexceptionable in tone—it does honour to its author, and is sure to prove a favourite with its readers. A striking feature in the book is—what for want of a better name we shall term—its truthfulness."—*Scottish Press.*

The Gloaming of Life: A Memoir of James Stirling, the League's First Agent. By the Rev. Alexander Wallace, Glasgow, Author of "The Bible and the Working Classes." "One of the most exquisite biographies of humble life which it has ever been our pleasure to peruse."—*Elgin Courier.*

The Scottish Temperance League's Specimen Packet of 78 Crown 8vo. Tracts, price One Shilling, Free by Post.

Scripture Testimony against Intoxicating Wine. By the Rev. William Ritchie, Dunse. Price 6d.

Volume I. of the Pictorial Tracts. This is a profusely Illustrated Volume of Temperance Tracts, and will be found well adapted for Village Libraries and Loan Tract Societies, as well as for general reading. Price, in Limp Cloth, 1s ; Free by Post for 13 Postage Stamps. In extra Cloth gilt, 1s 6d ; by Post for 19 Postage Stamps.

Specimen Packets of the Scottish Temperance League's Pictorial Tracts—Nos. 1 to 50, price One Shilling, Post Free ; Nos. 1 to 25, or Nos. 26 to 50, price Sixpence Each, Post Free.

The Moral Statistics of Glasgow. By William Logan. Price Sixpence, Post Free.

The Scottish Temperance League Hymn-Book. Arranged by the Rev. T. C. Wilson, Dunkeld. Price 2d, Post Free on receipt of Three Stamps, or 12s per 100.

The Harmony between the Gospel and Temperance Societies. By William Collins, Esq. Price 1½d. Two Copies Post Free, on receipt of Four Stamps.

Testimonies and Statistics in Reference to the Working of the Public Houses' Act. Price One Shilling, Post Free.

Rise and Progress of Whisky-Drinking in Scotland, and the Working of the Public Houses' (Scotland) Act, (Commonly called the Forbes Mackenzie Act). By Duncan M'Laren, Esq. Price Sixpence, Post Free.

Letter to the Right Hon. Spencer Horatio Walpole, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, by the Directors of the Scottish Temperance League. Being a Reply to the Statements made by the Deputation of Glasgow Publicans who waited on Sir George Grey and the Lord Advocate. Price Twopence, Three Copies sent Post Free on receipt of Six Postage Stamps.

Letter to Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace in Scotland, From the Directors of the Scottish Temperance League. Price 1d, or 6s per 100, Post Free.

PICTORIAL TRACTS,

Issued Monthly, Post Free, 2s per 100, or in 6d Packets, containing 25 Tracts, assorted, free by post. Already issued:—

1 Three Village Worthies
2 The Doctor's Devotee
3 The Confessions of a Drunkard
4 Who Drains the Sap out of us?
5 The Washing-Day
6 Strike for a Cheap Loaf
7 Bonnie Bessie Stewart
8 Tag Rag; What He Was, and What He Is
9 The Beginning of the End
10 Who Killed the Man?
11 What Twopence a-Day will do
12 Hold to the Right
13 The Mother's Boon
14 Moderation
15 The Two Soldiers
16 My Brother's Keeper. A New-Year's Tract
17 I did it for You; or, The Brother's Reply
18 Love is Strong as Death
19 The Public-House *versus* The Savings Bank
20 The Doctor
21 Strong and Weak
22 Past and Present
23 Mary Nicoll; or the Downward Path
24 Hugh Hart; or the Pleasures of Drinking
25 Supper in Chambers
26 The Deacon and the Dog
27 Little Mary
28 Dissolving Views. A New-Year's Tract
29 Words and Deeds
30 Example
31 The Only Son of his Mother
32 The American Lady's Story
33 Temptation
34 The Tradesman's Sons
35 Roger Bell
36 Your Health, Sir!
37 George Thomson
38 The Buffalo Club
39 A Year's Experience
40 Drop the Subject. A New-Year's Tract
41 Cause and Effect
42 John Laing
43 The Widow's Son
44 Turning Over a New Leaf
45 The Head-ache and the Heart-ache
46 The Downward Course; or the Shepherd Ruined
47 The Two Mechanics
48 The Curse of the Village
49 The Two Johns of Rochdale
50 My Mother's Funeral
51 The Publican's Signboard, and What Became of It
52 Prayers and Pains
53 Who is Safe?
54 Upwards and Onwards
55 The Reform Bill
56 The Convict's Story
57 Glasgow Green
58 What makes a Happy Fireside
59 The Lost Brother
60 The Lost One
61 The Sisters
62 I Don't Care for It
63 Wm. Halkett; or the Danger of Irresolution
64 A Word in Season
65 Richard Weaver
66 The Willow Bed
67 The Rescued Brand
68 The Price of a Pot

500 Tracts sent, carriage unpaid, for 7s 6d.

PERIODICALS.

The Scottish Review: A Quarterly Journal of Social Progress and General Literature. Price 4s per annum, Post Free, when Prepaid, and ordered from the Publishing Office in Glasgow.

Weekly Journal of the Scottish Temperance League. Price One Penny. To facilitate the transmission of the *Journal*, packets (of not fewer than four copies) will be sent, *post free*, to any part of the United Kingdom. By remittances being made in *advance*, parcels will be sent as under :—

4 Copies for 4d	...	Per Quarter,	4s 4d.	
8 " 8d	...	"	8s 8d.	
12 " 1s 0d	...	"	13s 0d.	
16 " 1s 4d	...	"	17s 4d.	

Single stamped copies sent to any part of the kingdom for 2s 2d per quarter, or 4s 4d per half-year ; these copies will be impressed with Government stamp, so that they will be suitable for re-transmission. The *Weekly Journal* is printed during Thursday night and Friday morning, and posted in time to reach all parts of the kingdom on Saturday.

The Adviser, A Monthly Magazine for the Young, is commended to the favourable attention of Parents, Teachers, Superintendents of Juvenile Meetings, and all other Friends of Youth, as a Publication remarkably well fitted to Educate the Young in the principles of Temperance, and, at the same time, favourably to impress the minds of the Adult portion of the community. Price ½d each. The New Book Post affords very great facilities for the general circulation of the *Adviser*, of which all Friends of Youth are respectfully urged to avail themselves. Packets, price 5d each, containing 10 of any number of the *Adviser*, assorted, forwarded, free by Post to any address in the United Kingdom, on receipt of the amount in postage stamps.

*** *The Volume of the Adviser, for* 1860, *is very suitable for Prizes or Presents. Price* 6d, 1s, *and* 2s.


COWAN'S BINDER GLASGOW